

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 1879.

The Week.

THE President has vetoed the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Bill. The bill had a rider attached, which repealed the provisions of the Enforcement Act giving United States supervisors appointed by the courts authority to "formally scrutinize, count, and canvass each ballot cast at Congressional elections," and authority to United States marshals and deputy-marshals to challenge and arrest and preserve order at the polls, and prescribing penalties for interfering with them in the discharge of their duties. The message again asserts the right of the Federal Government to regulate Congressional elections, by the usual citations from the Constitution; points out that the act which it is sought to repeal has been in operation eight years, and its constitutionality has not been impugned by any United States court; shows its utility in preventing fraud by reference to the elections in this city and State in 1868, and the report of a committee of Congress composed in the main of Democrats thereon; and closes by dwelling on the necessity of making elections safe and orderly for all classes of voters.

The net outcome of the extra session during the week has been the passage by Congress of the bill providing for the redemption of the subsidiary currency, with a limitation of its legal-tender quality to ten dollars—one more measure in the disastrous series at the head of which stands the Bland Bill. The House failed, 112 to 91, to overcome the veto of the Legislative Bill, and the Democratic caucusing has begun again, with greater vigor and secrecy than ever. In the Senate much time has been unprofitably spent in considering some oddly-expressed but respectably-signed memorials of ex-soldiers and sailors from Rhode Island, alleging violation of the rules of civil-service reform in the Providence custom-house, and Federal interference at the polls in local elections. The debate ran off into the comparative number of votes cast in Congressional districts entitled to equal representation, and Mr. Blaine subjected "Ben" Hill to a severe statistical catechism as to the Georgia districts in which Democratic representatives were chosen "without opposition." The special committee to report on Mr. Pendleton's bill giving Cabinet officers a seat and a voice in Congress, was named on Thursday. It consists of Messrs. Pendleton, Voorhees, Bayard, Butler, Farley, Conkling, Allison, Blaine, Ingalls, and Platt.

The contest in the Ohio Republican Convention is generally admitted to have been a contest between the Grant interest, represented by Judge Taft, the last Grant Attorney-General, and the Sherman interest, represented by Mr. Charles Foster, well known for his hostility to Grantism and carpet-baggery at the South. The ease with which the latter obtained the nomination has excited general surprise, as it seems to indicate that the Grant movement has either greatly declined in strength or never had so much strength in Ohio as people thought it had, and Mr. Sherman has accordingly become more prominent as a Presidential candidate than he has hitherto been. The conduct of the Sherman "boom," which will probably henceforward be very marked, we may be sure will be a very striking example of shrewdness and dexterity. The platform and Mr. Foster's speech of acceptance both show that the essential features of the Grant "boom" are to be carefully incorporated in the Sherman "boom," and especially the idea that everything amiss that has been done in Congress during the present session is the work of the "brigadiers" of the South rather than of the Democratic party as a whole, and must therefore be met by a renewal of the passions of the Civil War—a view which, we

need hardly say, nothing in the facts will warrant. In support of it both Mr. Foster and General Garfield paraded themselves before the Convention as converted Liberals, and declared they were as good "Stalwarts" as could be found anywhere, which was anything but a dignified or cheerful spectacle.

The platform pledges the party to free suffrage, equal rights, and the unity of the nation; appeals to the people to arrest the mad career of the party now controlling both branches of Congress; denounces the attempts to coerce the President by withholding the appropriations; castigates the Democratic conspirators for uncalculated agitation of financial questions, for hostility to the resumption of specie payments, for tampering with an unsurpassed currency system, for reopening sectional controversy by threatening to repeal all war legislation and inaugurate a reactionary revolution; praises the Republican party for the resumption of specie payments, for the refunding of the public debt, and for raising the national credit; condemns the perpetual disturbance of the country; sends greeting to the President and the Republicans in Congress for their resistance to the designs of the majority of the present Congress; castigates the Democratic Legislature of Ohio for fraud and jobbery; protests against the removal of Union soldiers from Congressional offices, and 'cutely keeps dead silence on the silver question, or, in other words, the most important financial question of the day.

The *New York Times* continues to make steady progress in truthfulness and sincerity in its mode of looking at public affairs, so much so that we begin to have hopes even of the *Tribune*. It recognizes in Mr. Foster's late talk an example of how readily "a sagacious and on the whole fair-minded man may yield to the unfavorable influence exerted by partisan managers," and charges him with "espousing the tactics of those who imagine that the revival of sectional animosities will atone for the want of sincerity on other subjects." This is good. A few words now from the same pulpit on the most ponderous falsehood of recent years, and perhaps, considering the numbers and character of the people who circulate it, the most discreditable—viz., that it is the Southern "brigadiers" in Congress who revived the sectional controversy—would do much good. The revival took place in 1876, and was begun by Republican orators, in Congress and on the stump, apparently as part of a prepared plan for saving the Republican party from the natural consequences of the Grant scandals and the carpet-bag scandals, and for avoiding the currency issue. Mr. Blaine opened it in Congress by "prodding," and Vice-President Wheeler announced it as "the key-note of the campaign" in the first speech of the canvass of 1876. We do not say the "brigadiers" would not have behaved in Congress just as they have behaved, even if the Republicans had abstained from provocation; but the Republican responsibility for the first renewal of sectional animosity is an historical fact which admits of no question.

We print on another page a letter from a correspondent in Mississippi who protests against the stories in circulation at the North, where they find ready credence, concerning the violence offered to intending emigrants from that State. What a mischievous use may be made of them was well illustrated last week, when an adventurer by the name of Conway, who had been conspicuous in reconstruction times in Louisiana, and who has lately attached himself to the negro movement westward, called upon the President and represented that boats were not allowed to land and take off the refugees on the lower Mississippi. The President unsuspectingly told him that the navigation of that river was free and the right of locomotion established by law, and that the blacks would be protected in their going if necessary. Conway then intimated that he wanted no other assurance to charter steamboats himself

and rescue the unfortunates who were prevented from leaving the South, and immediately reported the interview to a Washington paper, with the anticipated effect of getting it circulated by the Associated Press. The Louisiana and Mississippi Congressional delegations at once went to expostulate with Mr. Hayes, showing him that he would be represented to the blacks as desiring the emigration to go on, and the Government as preparing to send boats to fetch them. The President saw the false position into which he had been led, and was willing to be taken out of it if there was any way. But his excuse that the answers he had given Conway were based on an alleged condition of affairs was defective in this, that he did not guard against the worthlessness of his informant as he ought to have done.

The majority of the committee on the State debt, appointed by the Constitutional Convention of Louisiana, have presented a report recommending that only \$4,000,000 be paid, and that the interest be reduced from seven to four per cent. The consolidated debt at present amounts to about \$12,000,000, to which sum it was reduced by a scaling process about four years ago. The bondholders agreed to the reduction because at the same time an amendment was added to the Constitution which secured to them the full payment of their principal and interest as then determined. Now an attempt is made to repudiate most of what was then acknowledged to be the legal debt of the State, on the flimsy pretext that the constitutional amendment was not promulgated according to law, and that the Legislature which passed the Funding Act was an illegal one supported by the Federal military power and not elected by the people. The constitutional amendment was adopted, however, in regular and legal form, and its validity and binding force have been repeatedly acknowledged by the State in paying the interest on the bonds affected by it. The legality of the Legislature which passed the Funding Act was decided when Kellogg was recognized by the general Government, and up to this time the validity of the act has not been disputed. The interest on the debt has not been paid for several months, and cannot be paid without an increase of taxation or an honest assessment, to neither of which the people will consent. The shameful part of the business is that while the Constitutional Convention is looking for excuses to shuffle off a debt incurred lawfully and recognized in the most solemn manner, taxation remains ridiculously low.

The Catholic archbishops and bishops assembled in New York for the consecration of the new Cathedral have signed an address to the Catholics of the United States asking for subscriptions to enable Archbishop Purcell, of Cincinnati, to discharge his liabilities. The address carefully avoids all defence and extenuation of the archbishop's management of the funds, and expressly disavows all intention of making the proposed relief a precedent in other cases in which ecclesiastics may get into pecuniary difficulties. The prelates distinctly point out that the movement is simply one of charity towards the archbishop, and the tone of the appeal might be called excellent if it were not that it seems to impose on the "honor and charity of the creditors" some sort of obligation to meet the promoters of the subscription half way, "especially as so very large a proportion of the entire debt consists of accumulated compound interest." But then the accumulation of compound interest is an essential feature of the business of savings-banks which the archbishop undertook. All interest not drawn is in law and morals a new loan, and to use the creditor's frugality and forbearance in letting it lie as an argument for his surrendering a part of his whole debt is to put a very unfortunate construction on the prudence of the poor. The assets amount to \$1,181,569, from which must be deducted \$404,798 of "doubtful" and "worthless" notes. The liabilities, after a surrender by some creditors of one-half their claims, amount to \$2,490,881.

If the report in the *Boston Advertiser* be correct, some very striking things were said the other day at the twelfth annual meeting of the Free Religious Association. It will surprise most people to

hear from Professor Felix Adler that so convenient a thing as "free religion" was first thought of by Mr. O. B. Frothingham. This is a great mistake. Mr. Frothingham may have been the first to invite others to share his free religion with him, but the plan of making a religion for one's self has been secretly followed from the earliest ages. Then we can hardly believe that Mr. Abbott called for "intellectual unity" among the Free Religionists. We had supposed that there was nothing they would find so disagreeable as a man who entirely agreed with them. Mr. James Parton enlivened the occasion by using his "religion" as a club, armed with which he "went for" such diverse persons as the Czar, Bismarck, Joseph Cook, Anthony Comstock, Noah Porter, Moody and Sankey, Turner the painter, and others, and he even so far forgot himself as to speak disrespectfully of the daily press. In fact, anybody who establishes "intellectual unity" with him will find himself in need of prolonged intellectual rest and recreation after the job is done.

There was during the week a sharp advance in the London price of silver bullion—from 51½d. per ounce to 52½d. This rise brings the bullion value of the 412½-grain standard dollar up to \$0.8817; it is but a few weeks since it was only \$0.8314. It is not improbable that efforts will be made to enact the Warner free-coinage silver bill at this session of Congress, but it is considered certain that the bill cannot become a law. The money market has been more or less disturbed during the week by the settlements at the Treasury for ten-dollar certificates, and the rate for demand loans has been as high as 6 per cent., although in the latter part of the week it was down to 3 to 4 per cent., since money was freely coming out of the Treasury in payment for called 5-20 bonds. In London money continues extremely easy. Exchange on London has ruled somewhat below the point which takes gold abroad. The activity in the money market here has interfered with the sales of U. S. bonds, and the 4 per cents have sold at 102½ to 102¾ to 103½ to 102¾ to 102¾. At the Stock Exchange the week has been dull. Mercantile business is going on satisfactorily and encouragingly in every department. The outlook for the cereal crops now promises fine harvests.

A fortnight ago the Bank of France presented the extraordinary spectacle of having more coin in its vaults than paper in circulation, and the disproportion goes on increasing. That is to say, the notes in circulation amounted to \$435,000,000, while the metallic reserve amounted to \$436,000,000. On the 1st of January, 1877, the reserve amounted to \$433,800,000, of which \$306,100,000 was gold and only \$127,700,000 silver. On the same day of 1878 it amounted to \$465,400,000, of which \$232,700,000 was gold, while the amount of silver had risen to \$172,700,000. On the 1st of January, 1879, the reserve was \$408,300,000, of which only \$196,700,000 was gold, while the silver had risen to \$211,600,000. This state of things has arisen, too, in spite of all the efforts of the bank to keep the silver afloat, both by refusing small bills and in other ways. It continues to lose its gold; and at the same time the silver, instead of being sought by a suffering people, is piled up in the bank-vaults as soon as received. In fact, a most uncomfortable suspicion has begun to pervade the French mind that the result of keeping up the double standard, even nominally, is that other nations are "unloading" their spare silver on France, and the people, who have greatly changed their commercial habits within a few years owing to the establishment of provincial banks, or *Sociétés de Dépôts*, and the use of checks, will not carry or keep their Fathers' Dollar; they prefer paper.

The tricky procrastination of the Porte in dealing with the Greek question, and the almost equally tricky attitude of the Beaconsfield Ministry towards it, have at last thoroughly irritated France, which has, since the Berlin Congress, constituted herself the special patron of the Greeks, and M. Waddington has accordingly issued a very energetic circular-note, calling on the Powers to accede to the Greek request for mediation, and urge on the Porte to reopen negotiations with the Greeks in Constantinople, and, if the parties cannot agree there, to call another European Conference.

This note has been followed up by an almost acrimonious article against England in the *République Française*, Gambetta's organ, which is the more remarkable as Gambetta was an admirer of Lord Beaconsfield's policy in the early Jingo period. It is not in Greece alone that England is charged with refusing loyal co-operation, but in Syria and Egypt.

The Austrian convention with Turkey relating to the occupation of Bosnia and Novi-Bazar has been published, and to the great surprise of the public the preamble declares that "the fact of the occupation in no way prejudices the sovereign rights of the Sultan." This is a most dexterous and useful stroke on the part of Count Andrassy. It relieves the Porte of the heavy burden of confessing to the Mussulmans of the empire that it has ceded territory to a Power which had not assailed it in arms, which, to a good Mussulman, would have the air of sacrilege; it shuts the mouths of the Hungarians who have been declaring that the occupation would end in annexation, and the Magyars would be swamped by the Slavs; and it gives Austria the air of scrupulous moderation in carrying out the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin. On the other hand, however, nobody—or next to nobody—believes that the sovereign rights of the Sultan have the smallest prospective value, or that he will ever be able to exercise them. Long before the question of terminating the occupation can arise the Porte will probably have disappeared from the list of European Powers, and its claim on Bosnia have become as unsubstantial as that which the kings of Sardinia, down to our own day, used to put forward on their coins to the sovereignty of Cyprus and Jerusalem.

The condition of the Ministry in England does not improve, in spite of the acquisition of the "scientific frontier" from Yakub Khan. The Duke of Argyll made an attack on them in the House of Lords a fortnight ago, in a speech which has not been matched in power and brilliance in that body within the present generation, and Lords Beaconsfield and Salisbury had nothing to say in reply except that it was indiscreet to assail them at such a critical period, and that they were doing as well as they could. It has come out distinctly in an address of General Obrutshoff, confidential representative of the Czar in Eastern Rumelia, that the Sultan has positively promised Russia that he will not occupy the Balkans—or, in other words, that he surrenders "the impregnable frontier" for securing which at Berlin the English plenipotentiaries got their Garters. Worse than all, this is believed to point to a secret understanding between Russia and Turkey which promises ill for the British protectorate of Asia Minor, and which the progress of the war in South Africa is likely to strengthen. The old indifference to the Christian populations which was from the beginning Lord Beaconsfield's hobby, seems to survive, however. The Ministry is ostentatious in its reluctance to do anything for the Greeks, and Sir Henry Layard the other day, on his return to Constantinople, actually abused the Bulgarian nationality in a public speech which seems to indicate that Philo-turkism is a veritable mania.

Nothing can be worse than the news from Zululand. Over 26,000 British regulars are now in the field, or on their way to it, a larger force than fought at the Alma; the sickness is very great; the difficulties of transportation look as if they were insurmountable; the cost of the war is \$2,500,000 a week, which is rolling up a great floating debt not set down in the estimates, and the Duke of Cambridge has acknowledged that the strain on the army organization is even now severe. Twenty-five hundred men have already perished in action or through disease, and Cetewayo has taken up a very difficult position in the northeastern corner of his territory, and is resolved, it is said, to fight to the last. In fact, the only feature in the whole situation which has anything hopeful about it is that the enemy is a savage, and may therefore collapse at any moment. But the chances are that he will not collapse until he has ruined the Jingo policy from top to bottom, and until the Ministry has had to face its angry dupes at the polls in a general election.

Cardinal Newman, in replying to an address of congratulation

from his English friends in Rome the other day, devoted himself to a reiteration of the reprobation of "liberalism" in religion which he expressed so freely in the *Apologia*—meaning "the doctrine that there is no positive truth in religion, but that one creed is as good as another," and theology is a mere "collection of opinions." The only refuge from the confusion of "liberalism" he, of course, finds in the Catholic Church; but he failed, as usual, to account for the fact that "liberalism" began in the Church itself, which, if we are to judge from ecclesiastical history, keeps out of "liberalism" only those who are themselves resolved to stay out of it. Almost on the day on which he was speaking, a fresh and striking illustration of the inability of Churches to give stability to doctrine was afforded by the action of the United Presbyterian Synod of the Scotch Church, which has just been holding its annual session in Edinburgh. It ordered the reference to a committee for revision of the Westminster Confession and other "subordinate standards" of the Church. The result has been a new declaratory act, which, while reciting the old articles of faith in the old terms, declares them not inconsistent with newer and often contradictory views of the same thing. Moreover, a minister, Mr. Macrae, who in debate in the Synod repudiated the doctrine of eternal damnation, was then and there tried for heresy, and convicted by the committee appointed for the purpose; but the Synod refused to excommunicate him, and handed him over to another commission. During the discussion on his case most of the leading divines of the Church repudiated the doctrine of eternal punishment as set forth in the Westminster Confession, declaring that hell-fire was not in their opinion material fire, but simply remorse or consciousness of sin, and "the darkness of separation." There is no Church in which the doctrine of eternal torment by burning has been so firmly held or is so plainly laid down in the standards as in the Scotch Church.

The selection of the nine Cardinals who have been appointed along with Dr. Newman has excited almost as much surprise as the appointment of Newman himself, so completely has the Pope travelled out of the old field. In the first place, of the ten only three are Italians, a very unusual proportion; in the second, all are men of considerable distinction; and, in the third, they have no connection with the old set who ruled the Vatican in Pío Nono's day, and who look on them very much as Simon Cameron and "Zach" Chandler look on "dam literary fellers" in politics. In fact, the "Stalwarts" of the Curia do not like the new policy of conciliation at all, think it "mushy," and want to make it "hot under the old flag," instead of welcoming the anti-infallibilist "theorists" and "brigadiers," and sharing the offices with them. The Pope has, however, not made his selection from any new school of theology, but from a new kind of men. Cardinal Haynald, for instance, the Hungarian, is an out-and-out Liberal, while Cardinal Fürstenberg, the German, is an Ultramontane. All, or nearly all, are men whom the old Pope could not abide. Overtures, it is said, have been made by Leo XIII. to Dr. Dollinger for a reconciliation; but the sturdy old theologian will have nothing to do with the Vatican, and has no more confidence in the present Pope than in his predecessor. He says in a published letter that Dr. Newman, who "in genius and knowledge stands so high above the Roman clergy," "would never have been made a cardinal if his real opinions had been known at Rome. Had Newman written in French, Italian, or Latin, many of his books would have been placed on the Index."

The *Culturkampf* may be fairly said to have opened in France by the consent of the Council of State to the prosecution of the Archbishop of Aix for having prescribed the reading in all the churches of his diocese of a pastoral denouncing the proposed school laws of the Ministry, which is a violation both of the Concordat and of the statute, by which the use of the churches for any purpose but religious worship or sermons on strictly religious subjects is prohibited. One of our Paris correspondents presents elsewhere the Conservative as distinguished from the clerical view of the subject.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MR. FOSTER'S NOMINATION.

THE nomination of Mr. Foster by the Republicans for the governorship in Ohio, in preference to Judge Taft, seems to be generally taken as an indication that the more rational and moderate wing of the Republican party is again acquiring weight and ascendancy. Judge Taft was a prominent figure in the last Presidential canvass as General Grant's Attorney-General, and supplied very freely whatever legal opinions were necessary to justify the various instrumentalities, ordinary and extraordinary, which were used to secure the Republican triumph, and we presume is still very "stalwart" in his opinions. Mr. Foster, on the other hand, was an intimate friend and adviser of Mr. Hayes in the trying times before and after the election, and fully approved of what has been called the President's "policy" towards the South. That he is not so reflective a man as that seemed to indicate, however, has been proved by the fact that within a year, if we remember rightly, the Stalwarts so frightened him by "prodding" that he abandoned his first position, and confessed that the President's policy was a mistake and that the South had broken its pledges to him. Nor is his position on the silver question by any means what is to be desired in a gentleman who undertakes to represent the Republican party in an important State election. He not only voted for the Stanley Matthews resolution, but for the Bland Bill; and as the Ohio platform dexterously omits all reference whatever to silver, he will, if he pleases, be able to conceal from all mortal eyes during the canvass the precise position he now occupies on that important subject. If we are to infer what it is from his votes in Congress, he cannot occupy a worse one.

As he probably would not have obtained the nomination, however, if he had not admitted that the President's "policy" was a mistake, and will take his stand on this idea during the campaign, it seems to be very desirable to try and find out what is meant by saying that the President's treatment of the South has been a mistake, and that the South has broken its pledges to him. This enquiry, let us say, has a very important bearing on the controversy now pending between the Democrats and Republicans over the use of the army by the Executive. If the Stalwart view of the President's duty towards the South, as expressed in their criticisms of the course pursued by Mr. Hayes and in their longings for General Grant, be accepted by the party, it will be very difficult to deny the reasonableness of the Democratic apprehensions. In fact, we will go so far as to say that, if there be any danger of any President's using the powers which the irreconcilable wing of the Republican party claimed for President Grant and denounce President Hayes for not exercising, the Democrats would not only be excusable for abolishing the array, but it would probably be their duty to do so, even at the cost of any amount of temporary derangement of the Government.

It is to be observed, in the first place, that the notion that the President has made a mistake in his treatment of the South, and that the South has broken its pledges to him, could not have obtained a lodgment in anybody's mind who had not looked on General Grant as in some sense a dictator, and Mr. Hayes, therefore, as succeeding to dictatorial powers, which he unwisely laid aside. The whole theory that the latter could have made or did make a bargain with "the South," or with certain persons on behalf of the South, as to what was to happen after the troops were withdrawn, rested on the assumption that the South was, in spite of the working of the machinery of State government, living under martial law, and that the President was able to keep the troops in any place he pleased, or make whatever use of them he pleased, without reference to the wishes of the State authorities or the decisions of the State courts. That General Grant held some such view was plainly shown by his informing Mr. Randolph, of New Jersey, that Governor Hampton's notice to him that the Supreme Court of South Carolina had decided that he was the lawful governor was an "impertinence," and that he cared nothing for the Supreme Court. To those who thought President Grant's idea of his position the correct one there was, of course, no reason why Mr. Hayes should

not have taken it up, and sent and kept troops not where the law empowered him to send and keep them, but wherever he thought they would be most useful in repressing violence and preventing the "rebels" from becoming too prominent in politics. It is only in this character of a dictator, or of a man raised above the law, like the Emperor of Russia in Poland or the Emperor of Austria in Bosnia, that he could use troops for any purpose but the execution of the United States laws, or the repression of disorder on the request of the State governor or legislature, or keep them in any place or building to the occupation of which the State authorities were lawfully entitled. It is only in this character, too, that Mr. Hayes would have been justified in withdrawing the troops on receiving a pledge from anybody not engaged in the commission of crime. As President of the United States he is bound to use the troops in certain contingencies defined by law, and he has no right to make any agreement with indeterminate bodies of politicians that he will not use them. If he made any bargain with "the South," or any set or class of Southerners, about the use of them, he therefore violated his oath of office, or, in other words, committed an impeachable offence, and the Democrats would be justified now in seeking to impose the sternest restrictions on his command of the army. We hold, however, that he did not do so; that he desisted from armed interference in South Carolina and Louisiana because the needful constitutional contingency did not present itself, and because he had the assurance of the constituted authorities that they were able to repress insurrection and domestic violence without the aid of the Federal force. Any other construction of his conduct would, we repeat, justify the Democrats in taking extraordinary precautions against his having a disciplined force ready for the execution of his orders.

When we come to enquire who at the South gave the pledges to Mr. Hayes we find ourselves treading on ground still more delicate. The pledges must have consisted either in promises on the part of intending criminals that they would not engage in insurrection or commit acts of violence, or in promises on the part of certain prominent men that they would not, if elected to Congress, initiate or support certain legislative measures. We need hardly argue against the first of these hypotheses. Nobody believes Mr. Hayes got guaranties from intending criminals that they would not break the laws, or that if they had refused to give them he would have been justified in occupying the States which they inhabit with a military force. What most people at the North mean when they say "the South has violated its pledges to Mr. Hayes," if they attempt to define their thoughts at all, is apparently that the Southern whites agreed that they would not send "brigadiers" or men prominently engaged in the Rebellion to Congress, or that if they did these "brigadiers" would not originate legislation or support any legislation disapproved of by the Republican members, or, in fact, in any way make themselves obnoxious to loyal people at the North. But here, again, we need hardly say that supposing this pledge to have been possible and to have been given and received, it puts the Republican President in a position which not only would fully justify his being deprived of the army, but would seem to call for his impeachment. An agreement between the President and any American constituency restricting their choice of representatives in the House or Senate would, if imposed by a threat of military coercion, be a revolutionary act calling for the promptest and sternest punishment of every one engaged in it. It would be, indeed, the sum of every species of electioneering fraud, and would make the forms of free government a mockery. If, on the other hand, the leading Southerners elected to Congress promised the President not to introduce or support certain acts or resolutions, and not to make themselves prominent in the business of either House, in order to induce him to withdraw the United States forces from their State, the contract would also have been highly criminal, and would have exposed both parties to impeachment. It would have been a fraud on the Government of the United States and on each constituency whose representative entered into it, and would have deservedly consigned all concerned in it to infamy.

In short, the "pledge" story is, we need hardly say, not only an invention, but a very mischievous one. It puts the President in a false light, and if accepted would completely disable the Republicans in their present fight with the Democrats over the army, by showing clearly that a Republican Administration was not fit to be trusted with the army, and was actually already engaged in a scheme for changing the form of government. It has some value, however, as an illustration of the extent to which the war blurred men's ideas of the nature and conditions of constitutional government.

There is one other perilous notion which Mr. Foster has taken up, apparently on the recommendation of Mr. Conkling, but we would respectfully advise him to drop it with precipitation, or at all events not try to burden the Republican party with it. We mean the assertion which he made with much solemnity in Ohio the other day, in his speech of acceptance, that we are

"menaced with the startling proposition that the 18,000,000 of Northern people who pay 89 per cent. of the taxes, import 96 per cent. of the foreign goods, and conduct 92 per cent. of the internal commerce of the country, are to have the constitutional amendments and the results of the war interpreted, the policy of finance and taxation, internal and external commerce, determined upon, and ruled by a portion of the country that pays but 11 per cent. of the taxes, imports only 4 per cent. of the foreign goods, conducts but 8 per cent. of our internal commerce."

Without dwelling on the inaccuracy and unfairness involved in crediting the part of the country in which taxes are first levied with the final payment of the amount levied, we would ask Mr. Foster whether he really means that political power ought to be distributed on the basis of taxation, and that the men who pay most custom and excise duties ought to rule the country? This is a much more "startling proposition" than any that has emanated from "the brigadiers." "The brigadiers" have been very foolish, but the Republican majority is not yet large enough to warrant the party in loading itself with theories which would make the President a kind of black-coated fatherly Kaiser, assisted by a congress of prominent importers and manufacturers.

REACTION IN GERMANY.

IN a trial of strength which took place in the Reichstag last month a motion proposed by Dr. Loewe, seconded by Herr Windthorst, supported by Von Varnbüler and Kleist-Retzow, and accepted by the Government was carried by a large majority. This combination of allies is characteristic of the present situation. It is hardly a year since every one of these men was in more or less pronounced opposition—an opposition which in some cases was both political and personal, and in at least two had an infusion of religious rancor. Dr. Loewe, an old Frankfort parliamentary leader and a free-trader, did not at once forget, when he returned from exile, the claims of civil and commercial freedom; Von Varnbüler, a Württemberg Separatist, is at heart as hostile to unity as he was on the day of Sadowa; Kleist-Retzow is a Prussian High-Church Tory, and has bitterly opposed every measure of Liberal reform; while as for Windthorst, he will be recognized even in this country as the adroit, able, unscrupulous, and uncompromising agent of the fallen Hanoverian dynasty and the militant force of Ultramontanism. It will be seen that Prince Bismarck has chosen his friends without too nice discrimination, as becomes a master of realistic statesmanship. But if he is catholic in his tastes he is no less frank in the explanation of them. He does not plead, like the young lady in Beaumarchais's play, that he cannot prevent people from admiring him, or from voting for his tariff schemes. Probably the only scruples he has are about the Social Democrats. He does not court their support, which he is sure to have, and would prefer to see them with Lasker, Stauffenberg, Richter, and the other remaining defenders of the old economical traditions of Germany; but with this exception the new Protectionist majority is one which he hopes to hold permanently together for a general campaign against all forms of liberalism.

The outlook, therefore, is gloomy enough. While two-thirds of the protectionists are already Conservatives at heart, the other third will easily become such by association; and before the country awakes to the fact that it has "relieved home industry" only at the cost of reform and progress, the Chancellor will have welded his forces into a compact mass, obedient to every demand made upon it. Then he will begin to undo the work which has been so slowly and painfully accomplished since 1870. It is but too probable that Dr. Falk's days are already numbered. The fall of the Minister of Public Worship would be gratifying both to the Ultramontanes and the extreme Protestants; but each of these parties would demand other concessions, the former in the ecclesiastical laws, the latter in the system of local government. The provisions of the penal code would be sharpened and the powers of the police largely increased; and any general policy of reaction, if energetically undertaken, would not halt until the privilege of the press and of the platform was restored to the prudent and impressive limits which it had in the old pre-constitutional days. But perhaps the first achievement of the new majority will be to carry out their economical and financial "reforms" to a logical conclusion. One error easily breeds others. If a rational person were asked what are the three great truths which political economy, not to say the practice of enlightened governments, has most positively established, it seems to us the answer would necessarily be: free-trade, mono-metallism, and the folly of usury laws. The first has already been discarded in Germany both by the Government and the country, the semi-official press is beginning cautiously to attack the second, and the third enters commandingly into the programme of the Catholics and the Conservatives.

Against this desperate folly there is little organized resistance. The Party of Progress, to which the country has long been accustomed to look for the most consistent support of liberal politics and sound finance, was reduced at the last election to a mere handful, and under similar pressure a second time would be nearly crushed out of existence. The National Liberal party is going to pieces from internal decay. Half of its members, headed by Bennigsen, Gneist, and Treitschke, will follow Bismarck around toward the Right, and the rest will gravitate in the opposite direction, but the party as such will practically cease to exist. The National Liberal party has been for many years the most numerous, as it certainly is the ablest, in Parliament. It is typical of the German middle class—the learned, the respectable, and the moderate—but it is also typical in its timidity and indolence; and its history since 1866 is only the history of compromise and capitulation. Hardly a measure which has been adopted through its aid has had its unqualified approval. It has seldom taken up a bold position which it has not finally abandoned in deference to Prince Bismarck, and for the sake of peace. Such a party may be used for a time by a man like the Chancellor, but an obedience which has to be coaxed and persuaded as often as it is needed is not the thing for permanent work; and hence the relations between the two have always been merely experimental. In the course of his career Prince Bismarck has tried two characteristic methods of government: he has been a Cromwell and a Guizot. The four years preceding Sadowa, when he systematically defied parliament, the laws, and the constitution, may fairly be called the era of major-generals. From that time until the present he has essayed—and we believe sincerely, though under all the disadvantages of his temper and prejudices—to govern, like the ministers of Louis Philippe, with the aid of the bourgeoisie. And it is equally certain that he has failed in this also.

The Prince is now entering upon an experiment more momentous than either of these—the trial of the Napoleonic system, or government with the aid of the peasantry. The tariff enterprise is practically this and nothing else; for although protection is dear also to the manufacturers, and although the public advocates of it among the agriculturists are necessarily the educated nobility, his final, indispensable supporters are the peasantry. Not the artisans, not the nobles, but the peasants determine the complexion of the Diet under the operation of universal suffrage. Now, so long as

the Chancellor was involved in the ecclesiastical quarrel the country districts were permitted to send a good many National Liberals to Parliament, sometimes even Progressists, and the Conservative candidates were opposed by the influence of Bismarck and of the Government; the city members were sure to be Liberal, so that the balance of power remained with the middle class. But at the last general election the Liberals, being in opposition, lost nearly all the rural elections, and it was clearly shown that the Chancellor and the landed gentry acting together can practically control the peasant vote. Germany even offers such a man as Bismarck advantages superior in some respects to those of France. The peasants, on the one hand, have less natural wit, and the Liberals, on the other, are too much wedded to pedantic forms and distinctions—or, in other words, the “Cesar” is sure of a more compact following and a less compact opposition. The bureaucracy, too, is efficient when its heart is in the work, as in the present case it certainly is. It has lent Prince Bismarck only a grumbling co-operation during the past few years, but no other class rejoiced more loudly and sincerely at his rupture with the Liberals than the clerks and accountants and tax-gatherers and gendarmes of the civil service.

Under these circumstances there can be but one issue of the enterprise. Disagreeable as the statement may seem, it is still true that government with the bourgeoisie—that is to say, with the brains of the country—has for the present failed, and is to be followed by the government of one man of commanding talent, aided by an ignorant, superstitious, and docile majority of ploughmen. Of this the Liberals themselves seem to be convinced. They dread a dissolution with the correct instinct of men who prize their seats, and many of them, as was said above, have hastened to join the new majority. The Prince is confident, and with reason. He commands the situation, and, on the principle of Lord Beaconsfield's heraldic motto, deserves to command it; but the introduction of the Napoleonic system in Germany is nevertheless a spectacle which makes one enquire whether the country was quite ripe for universal suffrage. For after the system has been once tried subsequent trials will be much easier. The fastidious scruples of the aristocracy, which in Bismarck's favor are only suspended, will with time practically disappear, and from opponents of universal suffrage they will become its warmest friends. They have only to hold together themselves and the future is theirs. But a person unacquainted with Germany might enquire, Why may it not come about in the vicissitudes of politics that a great Liberal leader may arise and utilize the peasant vote to wise ends? The answer is easy. A Liberal statesman could control the peasant vote only if he were at the head of affairs, but such a contingency implies also a Liberal cabinet. Now, under a correct parliamentary system Herr von Bennigsen might well enough be the man. He has other than intellectual and political qualifications; he is of noble blood and orthodox belief. But he could hardly build a parliamentary cabinet in which Bamberger was not Minister of Finance and Lasker of Justice. These two are, however, literally impossible. They are Jews, and, as one of the speakers in the debate observed, the protectionist agitation is an uprising against Semitic theories. It will be long before an Israelite can be minister in Germany, and therefore (unless the race ceases to have talent, or is disqualified by law from public office) long before a homogeneous Liberal Ministry can be expected. And yet Germany is one of the most strenuous defenders of the rights of the Jews—in Rumania.

Let us not, however, be unjust to Prince Bismarck; he stands absolutely alone. There are good jurists in Germany, good financiers, good debaters, but he is the only statesman. The fact is, of course, lamentable, and nobody laments it more keenly than the Chancellor himself, who, if not too fond of rivals, has often as a patriot expressed fear lest he should leave no successor. Mischievous as are many of his views, exasperating as is sometimes his manner, one cannot leave the Chamber when he has taken a share in the debate without a renewed conviction of his boundless superiority to all other politicians, whether on the ministerial

bench or among the deputies, without feeling more strongly than ever before the really isolated position in which he stands. To such a man one can pardon many eccentricities both of opinion and of policy. Great statesmen are always costly treasures; but Prince Bismarck cannot live for ever, and after his death Germany will probably be able to gratify her taste for an indefinite time in the enjoyment of mediocrities.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

THE most obvious result of the life of the late William Lloyd Garrison, and the one most comprehensible to the present generation, is the abolition of negro slavery in 1863 instead of at some indefinitely later period. This, and the assurance, as Mr. Phillips remarked in his funeral discourse, that slavery will never be re-established on this continent, his countrymen feel that they owe specially to Mr. Garrison, and it forms, of course, the basis of all the grateful and honorable tributes with which the press and the pulpit have teemed during the past fortnight. That the service, however great we may esteem it, was no more confined to his native land than his fame has been or memory is likely to be, must be admitted by all who are capable of perceiving its political as well as its moral bearings. Mr. Garrison was not only the first Abolitionist of his time, he was also the most Republican of Republicans. He could not rest or be silent when once his attention had been drawn to the shocking contradiction involved in “the Union as it was” in his early manhood. He saw a government professedly founded on the brotherhood of man—on the idea, as we said last week, “that nobody exists for anybody else's benefit, and that every man is entitled to a fair opportunity of making the most of himself”—and yet tolerating and providing for a system which expressly denied these postulates. The irrepressible conflict that thereupon arose was between the modern idea for which Mr. Garrison spoke and the mediæval and pagan idea to which the slaveholders held. If government of the people, by the people, and for the people, as, thanks to this conflict, we can now call our own, is the missionary form of government, destined ultimately to prevail wherever civilization has obtained, it is not easy to overrate the influence of a great Republic reforming itself; and so far as this reformation began with Mr. Garrison, he will have had a share in political changes not yet consummated, even in countries where his name has never been heard.

The indirect consequences of his anti-slavery agitation are most readily overlooked now. In imagination the colored race is pictured weeping at the grave of its benefactor (hardly known, in fact, to the mass of them in comparison with Grant or Lincoln), whereas Mr. Garrison was as truly the liberator of the whites as of the blacks. The very success of his endeavors is an obstacle to the appreciation of his merits in this particular. It is almost impossible to realize the condition of American society fifty years ago, when Benjamin Lundy's zealous assistant began to arouse the complacent readers of the *Genius of Universal Emancipation*. We no longer know what it is to live in a community in which one subject, touching the foundations of the government not less than the rights of man, is tabooed, cannot be talked about without causing uneasiness, without incurring reproach, loss of position, and bodily risk, without liability to arrest and prosecution; cannot, if discussed in the press, have the freedom of the mails. We must fancy the Governor of Vermont entreating the Mayor of Okolona to suppress the *Southern States*, or the Legislature of Massachusetts offering \$5,000 for its editor, dead or alive, before we can understand the full significance of Mr. Garrison's “I will be heard.” That voice, crying in the wilderness of immoral apathy and cowardly submission, unloosed the tongues and the consciences of thousands; and the freedom of speech thus asserted, and maintained through all manner of perils, has become the heritage of every unpopular movement, of every variety of reform, of every shade of opinion, political or theological—a privilege so common that we forget its novelty, and cannot believe what price was paid for it. Those who look back to the early days of the *Liberator* will be convinced that the harsh language so much complained of was never more in place; the gag on Northern lips had been torn away, and to prove it something more was needed than a whisper.

Mr. Garrison's deeply religious nature being conceded, no feature of his career is more curious than the disrepute into which he fell among professing Christians of all denominations. His early training had been evangelical and sectarian, his study of the Scriptures both ardent and unremitting, and all his life long he freely drew from the Bible the texts which supported his denunciation of the sin of slavery. For some years

after he began to edit his paper he gave the usual outward signs of being a Christian in the conventional acceptance of the term. How he came to be regarded otherwise is easily explained. The moral code imposed on the whole country by slavery was upside down, and had Mr. Garrison been generally assisted in his attempts to right it by the clergy and the churches, his character would not have suffered. Since, however, they were all interested in retaining the code as it was, in calling light darkness and darkness light, they, equally with the avowed apologists of slavery—nay, still more, as recreant to their professions—merited his sternest censure, and they received it. The charge of infidelity was the natural retort of the times, and was attached to all his associates, so that the mere joining of the Abolitionists, without formal renunciation of doctrine, was deplored by sincere and humane church-members as a first step towards irreligion, and as a diversion from the prime duty of saving one's soul. Had Mr. Garrison adopted this view, it is questionable whether he would have saved a soul whose nobler instincts had been smothered, but it may be presumed that he would have lived in the odor of sanctity; by disregarding it he was enabled to substitute the ethics of Christianity for those of slavery in the allegiance of his countrymen, and to rescue from brutish promiscuity and hand over to Christian influences and Christian instruction four millions of human beings, to teach whom to read the Bible had been a felony. That in the midst of such a task, with the end almost in sight, the question (we believe in their first interview) of the friendly author of 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' "Are you a Christian, Mr. Garrison?" seemed almost quizzical, is highly credible.

A judicious writer in the *Evening Post*, while observing that, unlike some of his distinguished colleagues, Mr. Garrison can hardly be thought of except as an Abolitionist, leaves undecided the question, whether he would have attained eminence otherwise than as a reformer. However this may appear to his future biographer, for whom alone it will be worth while to discuss it, there is plenty of evidence that he was not a professional philanthropist. Of agitation for agitation's sake, as a means of living or of notoriety, he was wholly innocent. He was not only glad to stop, but he knew when to stop; and having advocated the dissolution of the American Anti-slavery Society at the close of the war, he resisted even the temptation to continue the *Liberator* for other objects than the main one. The welfare of the freedmen, however, continued to occupy his thoughts, and from the beginning of reconstruction down almost to his latest hour he wrote frequently for the press on national topics, and may be said to have died in harness. He held, and was in some measure responsible for, the Stalwart view of the total depravity of Southerners, and his reliance upon the general powers of the Government to protect the negro was apparently as vague and unlimited as that of any of Grant's adherents. He was a strict constructionist of the ante-bellum Constitution; he always denied that freedom was national and slavery sectional, because he could not juggle away the fugitive clause, the slave-trade clause, and the slave-representation clause; he never pretended that Congress could abolish slavery in the States, notwithstanding the clause guaranteeing a republican form of government. When freedom truly became national, however, he did not require chapter and verse for authority to defend and perfect the work begun by Mr. Lincoln's proclamation; nor, with Grant's two administrations before him, did he distrust the ability of Congress by law, and the President by force, to shield the freedmen from harm and to keep the governments at the South out of the hands of the white minority. Mr. Hayes's action in South Carolina and Louisiana seemed to him a surrender of the blacks to their oppressors, instead of the simple performance of a constitutional duty.

These sentiments, to the extent that they were not peculiar to himself, found favor with the ruling party, and were made use of by the leading politicians to divert attention from the real issues of the day. In this there was something retributive, where retribution was not to be looked for. The thirty years' war which Mr. Garrison had waged with slavery had unfitted him for the consideration of questions that cannot be settled by a simple appeal to elementary principles of right and wrong; and this led him to take a pessimistic view of the situation, the clues to which were, so to speak, no longer in his hands. When the slave power was everywhere dominant, when outrage followed outrage, and mob followed mob, through all the weary years of imperceptible progress, in the darkest hours of the rebellion, his cheerfulness never forsook him; his faith in God sustained his spirits and comforted him with the inevitable overthrow of slavery. When the time for statesmanship came, and the adaptation of means to ends in the restoration of shattered social and political fabrics, the fear that somehow this revolution might go backward—a fear so generally shared during Andrew Johnson's Ad-

ministration—appears to have overcome the hopeful temper of Mr. Garrison. Perhaps he found it easier to lay aside the rôle of agitator than of prophet. Certain it is that he regarded with suspicion the reports of white good behavior at the South, and accepted with a priori alacrity the tales of violence and injustice which suited the character of the man-stealers of old. It cannot be said that the South was at much pains to disabuse him, and his attitude towards it was the jealousy of a guardian whose wards have passed from him into unfriendly hands.

Of the personal qualities of Mr. Garrison, whether public or private, there is no occasion to speak here. His sincerity, courage, single-mindedness, purity, simplicity, modesty, were never called in question: time will fix his place as a writer and speaker, and pass the proper judgment on his methods. He has gone to his rest at a good old age, with his faculties undimmed, his sympathies as tender as in his youth, his conscience void of reproach, and leaving a name which owed as little to circumstances outside of himself as that of any self-made American of any period in our history.

THE FRENCH EDUCATIONAL LAW OF 1849.

PARIS, May 16, 1879.

THE "Ferry laws" concerning the schools of France threaten to be as troublesome as the "Falk laws" were at one time in Germany. The *Kulturkampf* has not done much good across the Rhine, and Prince Bismarck has shown lately an evident desire to come to an understanding with the Papal Court, or at any rate to find a better *modus vivendi* with the bishops. It is very surprising to me that the Republican Cabinet who came to power with M. Grévy should have started a clerical question: there was absolutely no necessity for it. It is impossible to live a month in France without being struck by the absolute religious tolerance which reigns in it. Thanks to M. Ferry, the parties will, perhaps, now permanently be obliged to style themselves as they do in Belgium, where there are no Whigs or Tories, but Catholics and Liberals.

The law which established free teaching in France dates from the time of the second Republic. It was discussed in 1849, and curiously enough, if its chief promoters were ardent Catholics, like M. de Montalembert, M. de Falloux, and Bishop Dupanloup, the law was carried in reality through Parliament by M. Thiers. Education, either primary or secondary (as we call it in France), had been intended by Napoleon I. to be a monopoly of the state: the University of France was destined to mould the very mind of the country, and even during the tolerant reign of Louis Philippe this tradition was still kept. Such men as Guizot, Villemain, Cousin, who had been professors at the University, did not encourage the efforts of the Church when the Church tried to have its own part in the education of French youth. The revolution of 1848 gave a great shock to their ideas; they had thought themselves safe under the veil of constitutionalism, with a *pays légal* (a legal country), composed of chosen electors, and a legal university, composed of picked professors. They suddenly saw that the whole fabric of French society could be overthrown with a blow; that constitutionalism had no real vitality; that it was a mere figment; that the people had been left, so to speak, at the mercy of obscure and ignoble teachers, who dreamt only of revolutions. The leaders of the Chamber of 1848, elected after the terrible downfall of the July monarchy, felt that they had something more to make than a political constitution, a new distribution of power between the executive and the legislature. France had had already too many constitutions; what was wanted was the spirit which teaches a people to respect its constitution. It was felt instinctively that the University had not well fulfilled its mission, that it had been too destructive of the past, too revolutionary, too servile at the same time towards the state.

The revolution of 1848 had taken France by surprise; the Chamber was elected as a protest of the departments against Paris. The election of Prince Louis Napoleon as President was another and more marked protest. The Comte de Falloux was chosen by the new President as Minister of Public Instruction in his first cabinet, and this choice was an event in itself; it marked a profound change in the temper of Parliament and of the country. Lacordaire, the famous Dominican preacher, wrote to M. de Falloux from Dijon on the 23d of December, 1848, when he heard that M. de Falloux had accepted the post of Minister of Public Education in the cabinet of Odilon Barrot, Drouyn de Lhuys, Léon Faucher, and Buffet:

"You will be in the cabinet the first Catholic minister that France has seen in it for sixty years; you will take your part in trying to settle an inconsistent epoch; you will give your name to liberties all the more

precious as they are born on the verge of anarchy; you will not re-establish the monarchy of Clovis, nor of Charlemagne, nor of Louis XIV., nor of Louis XVIII., but the monarchy of right and of justice."

You see here in this extract that the Catholics, the conservatives of 1848, cared little in reality for the monarchical form of government; they wanted only a conservative government; the spirit which inspired Lacordaire in 1848 is the same as the spirit which inspired the Duc de Broglie from 1870 to 1879.

On the 4th of January, 1849, the Comte de Falloux named two committees, and asked them to prepare two laws, one on primary education, the other on secondary education. In the list of the members of these committees I find the names of Cousin, Saint-Marc-Girardin, Montalembert, Dupanloup, Thiers. Thiers entered into the work with much spirit. He used to say to M. de Falloux: "Condé alone can sleep on the eve of Rocroi." He once developed the same thought in these terms: "You can go to sleep when the weather is fine, the air calm, and the sea tranquil; when the captain is a good captain, when the crew is not mutinous. But can we sleep now, when the sea is up, the tempest in full force? We have been for thirty years on an agitated sea; alas! we had gone to sleep, and now we have been nearly wrecked." The *procès-verbaux* of the sittings of the great committee named by the Comte de Falloux have been recently published. Montalembert took, of course, a very eminent part in the discussions; he had been during the eighteen years of the Government of July the champion of what we call "liberté d'enseignement" (liberty of teaching). He was the great Catholic agitator; he made newspapers, wrote pamphlets; he opened a school himself and was tried; he had correspondents in Poland, in Germany, in Belgium, in England. He was an admirable orator, and he had a faith in him which moved even his enemies. M. de Falloux, who presided over the committee of 1849, is still alive. Hardly anybody knew him in 1848. He was a Legitimist of the provinces, led a provincial life, and had written but little. He showed much calm and courage during the bloody insurrection of June; he was one of those men who can conduct other men by mere strength of character. The two committees he named soon merged into one; and the law which was discussed by this committee has been called by Lacordaire the Edict of Nantes of the nineteenth century. It is essentially a law of tolerance; it put an end to the absolute monopoly of state education, and gave a share in the education of the country to the Church as well as to the laity.

Bishop Dupanloup took a very prominent part in the deliberations of the committee on education; but I would particularly insist on the rôle of M. Thiers, as M. Thiers has become almost an idol for the Republicans of the day. M. Thiers is said to have walked on the quays of the Seine, smiling and playing with a little stick in his hands, looking on the various objects which were coming down the river, while a Parisian mob was sacking the archbishopric near Notre Dame. This happened some time after the revolution of 1848. Thiers was then a pure Voltairian. After the revolution of 1848 a great reaction took place in his mind. He wrote on the 7th of May, 1848, to his friend Madier de Montjau, the father of the present deputy:

"As for the liberty of teaching, I am changed. I am so not by a revolution in my convictions, but by a revolution in the social state. When the University represented the good and wise French bourgeoisie, taught our children after the methods of Rollin, preferred the healthy and old classical studies to the physical and materialistic studies of the promoters of professional teaching, oh! then I was willing to sacrifice to it the educational liberties. Now I am no longer in the same place—and why? Because nothing is in the same place. If the University, falling into the hands of phalansterians, intends to teach our children a little of mathematics, of physical and natural sciences, and much of demagoguery, I see no hope, if there is hope, but in the liberty of teaching. I do not say that this liberty ought to be complete and without any guarantee for public authority; for, after all, if there was a teaching of Carnot and a teaching of Blanqui, I should like to be able to stop at least the last one! At any rate, I repeat that the teaching of the clergy, which I did not like for many reasons, seems to me better than what is preparing for us. I was as I used to be; but I carry my hatred and my force of resistance where I see the enemy. The enemy is now demagoguery, and I will not abandon to it the last remainder of social order—that is, the Catholic establishment."

This letter was published at the time in all the newspapers. A few months afterwards M. Thiers published a theoretical treatise on "Property," in which he thought it necessary, in the face of French socialism, to demonstrate the legitimacy of property, and placed the principle of property "under the wing of religion." The ideal view which M. Thiers had of religion and of liberty was always a low one. Liberty of thought and of teaching, religious teaching, were never more in his eyes than the

agents, the gendarmes, of a certain social and political order. When M. de Falloux accepted the Ministry of Public Instruction offered by Prince Napoleon he called on M. Thiers and asked him for his support. M. Thiers promised it, and he became very active in the preparation of the new laws on education. "What do I see," said he once, "in each commune? The schoolmaster, a laic, who will always be dissatisfied with his position; with a smaller salary than the curé; having no resignation because he has no faith; thinking himself ill-treated, and nursing in his heart the hatred of a society which he considers egotistical and unjust." He is afraid he sees in the thirty-seven thousand French communes thirty-seven communists, thirty-seven thousand *anti-curés*:

"I ask formally for something better" (sitting of the 8th of January, 1849) "than these detestable small lay instructors; I want the *Frères* [the *Frères* of the Christian Doctrine are the ecclesiastical primary schoolmasters; they are placed at the same time under the supervision of the bishops and are inspected by the state inspectors of the French University], though I may have in old times been adverse to them. I wish to increase there the influence of the clergy; I want the action of the *curé* to be powerful, more than it is now, because I count much upon him for the propagation of the philosophy which teaches man that he is placed here to suffer, and will not propagate this other philosophy which says to man: 'Enjoy yourself; for, as M. Marrast has said, you are here to find *ton petit bonheur*; and if you don't find it in the actual situation, strike without fear the rich whose egotism refuses to you your part of happiness.' . . . Yes, I cannot say it enough, primary education can only produce good effects if the clergy get a large share of influence in its teaching."

This improvisation of M. Thiers produced a very great effect on the committee. I have only cited the most important parts; Thiers declared himself also against the principle of gratuity in primary education as well as against any compulsory clause.

The committee called for depositions; one of the first depositions was that of Father Philippe, the superior of all the Brothers of the Christian Schools. We learn from it that in 1849 his order had 3,300 members in France and instructed 200,000 children; it had also evening schools for apprentices. He spoke very strongly in behalf of the schools for adults: "The dangerous workmen are not those who frequent the schools; the common workman is good and honest, accessible to religious sentiments; the thirteen thousand adults who now attend our schools in Paris are very docile." Thiers asked Father Philippe if the superior of his order always resided in France. Father Philippe answered that the centre of his Institute was France; "the Brothers, wherever they are, even in Rome, depend on the Superior-General in Paris. In foreign countries the great establishments of the community are conducted by Frenchmen." "Then," said Thiers, "it is the French influence that you establish." "No," said Father Philippe, "we have nothing in view in the choice of the superiors except the religious interest."

This first direct contact of the leaders of the political parties and of the leaders of the religious movement was extremely curious; the politicians discovered, so to speak, a world unknown to them. It is perhaps a pity that the law of 1849 was made under the pressure of strong political passions; but, on the whole, it was inspired by generous sentiments. It gave to the Church a degree of toleration which had been unknown since the bloody days of the Revolution. Its clauses may be slightly amended in some points; it would be a great pity if for the spirit of the law of 1849 was substituted a spirit of exclusion against the Church and of proscription of all religious teaching.

AN EGYPTIAN COUP D'ÉTAT.

CAIRO, May 10, 1879.

THE result of the *émeute* of which I sent you an account has been a *coup d'état*, the consequences of which are still the subject of much diplomatic controversy. By one dash of the pen we Egyptians have become endowed with an avowed constitutional government—"a nation governed by the people, and the Khedive reigning without governing." How this precious conquest, which other nations have only obtained by centuries of internal strife and discord, has been brought about may not be without interest to your readers.

It is a matter of common notoriety that the Egyptian finances for the last three years have been in a state of the most deplorable confusion, due to a reaction from the inflated values caused by the high price of cotton during the American war; the great outlay of capital in improvements in the irrigation system; the establishment of free schools throughout Middle and Lower Egypt; the numerous sugar-factories; the annexation and reconnoissance of vast tracts of adjacent territory such as

Darfur, Kordofan, Harrar, and the Provinces of the Equator; the attempted suppression of the slave trade; the opening of the Suez Canal, whereby the large profits of the railway traffic between Suez and Alexandria were lost to Egypt; the enormous sums stolen by Sadyk Pasha, the former Minister of Finance; the Turkish tribute and "backsheesh"; the extended and much-abused "protection" of the richest Egyptian subjects by the European consulates, by means of which the former were exempted from paying taxes; and the lavish and reckless generosity of an Oriental sovereign. Most of the Khedive's expenditures were in themselves praiseworthy, but in face of the actual revenue of the land they were premature, and the money for them was obtained by loans at usurious rates. The inevitable "crash" came in 1875, when the Khedive applied to the Consuls-General of England, France, Austria, and Italy for financial experts to try and put matters to rights. France, Austria, and Italy sent respectively Messrs. de Blignières, Cremer, and Baravelli, who became purely Egyptian officials and went quietly to work. But England acted differently. The notes addressed to the Consuls-General were identical in their terms. It was clearly understood both by the Egyptian Government and by General Stanton, the then British Consul-General, that simply a financial expert was wanted, who was to have in his Egyptian position no official connection with the British Government. Mr. Disraeli's Government, intent upon a brilliant imperial policy, seemed at that time determined to make the English creditors of the Khedive a lever to obtain political supremacy in Egypt. Mr. Cave was sent out in a semi-official capacity by the British Government. He made his report but declined to accept the position of an Egyptian employé, which was all that had been asked for. A misunderstanding then ensued between General Stanton and his Government, which resulted in the replacement of General Stanton by Mr. Vivian. Then came Messrs. Joubert and Göschén, who represented the French and English creditors. They were deceived as to many essential facts by the able and cunning Sadyk Pasha, then Minister of Finance, who naturally wished to conceal his enormous defalcations. Messrs. Joubert and Göschén made an elaborate report and went away.

In the meantime Sadyk Pasha had entered into a conspiracy to depose the Khedive, whom he represented as about to sell Egypt to the Christians. The plan was discovered and Sadyk Pasha "committed suicide." After his fall the Khedive put himself almost entirely into European hands and the High Commission of Enquiry was created, which became practically the Egyptian Government, and no money could be spent without its consent. M. de Lesseps, the President of the Commission, being desirous to go back to France, the principal work devolved upon Messrs. Rivers Wilson, De Blignières, Cremer, Baravelli, and Riaz Pasha, and in August last Nubar Pasha was recalled from his banishment and the "responsible" ministry was formed—Nubar, President; Mr. Wilson, Minister of Finance; M. de Blignières, Minister of Public Works, and Riaz, Minister of the Interior. When these gentlemen entered upon their functions it was firmly believed that Egypt would slowly but surely recover, and that all would go smoothly and well. "Egypt belonged no longer to Africa, but to Europe, and would henceforth be governed by a responsible ministry." The coupons were all punctually paid, but the majority of the native employes, including the army, navy, and public instruction, were left entirely out of the budget. The discontent was aggravated by the importation of numerous scandalously-overpaid English and French employes. Several young gentlemen of scarcely two-and-twenty years of age were engaged at the rate of £130 per month, while natives and Europeans, long resident in the country, competent and experienced, who received £20 or £30, were discharged. An expensive cadastral survey was instituted to create offices for Europeans, and all the military schools—one of the most important elements of instruction in the country—were abolished.

In September the annual rise of the Nile proved to be exceptionally high. The High Commission of Enquiry had not appropriated any money for the usual precautions. The dykes were broken, and more than one hundred villages were destroyed in Lower and Middle Egypt, and the immense loss of life and property will never probably be accurately known. In February the misery of the officers being intensified by their summary discharge, they peremptorily demanded their arrears of pay. This was refused them, and an *émeute* followed which resulted in the fall of Nubar Pasha, who was replaced by Tewfik Pasha, the heir to the throne. Murmurs of the universal discontent began to be heard in the Chamber of Notables (a sort of incipient Egyptian Parliament). Riaz Pasha and Mr. Rivers Wilson then announced the dissolution of the Chambers. They refused to be dissolved, and issued manifestoes to their "con-

stituents," protesting against the maladministration of the Ministry. Matters began to look a little squally, and early in April Mr. Rivers Wilson, without consulting Tewfik Pasha, the President of the Council, presented a new scheme for the rearrangement of the finances to the Khedive, and at the same time expressed the wish that the Khedive would not interfere at all in public affairs. The Khedive replied that the Ministry had caused the native feeling to be so excited that he could, unfortunately, only assure the personal safety of the European residents by his interference, and that another financial plan had been decided upon which was much more to the advantage of the creditors. On the 7th of April (the next day) Sherif Pasha, whose resignation as Minister of Foreign Affairs was accepted last summer for having refused to appear before the High Commission of Enquiry, was called upon to form a new ministry, whereupon Riaz Pasha was excommunicated from the Moslem religion by the Sheikh-ul-Islam and sentenced to spiritual death (he left by the first boat for France), and the other ministers were dismissed together with all their numerous protégés. The present Ministry is termed a "National" Ministry. It is responsible to the Chamber of Notables in all matters relating to internal affairs and is responsible to the Khedive in all matters relating to foreign affairs, and the action of all executive functionaries is to be subject to the approval of a "Conseil d'État" composed of Egyptians and foreigners, with the foreign element preponderating. All the members of the present Ministry are Egyptians.

Whether all this is for the advantage of the country remains to be seen, but it should be borne in mind that the majority of the European residents here, including Mr. Vivian, the British Consul-General, have been strongly opposed to the Nubar-Wilson-de Blignières Ministry, who, by their vanity, want of tact, and nepotism, have produced a reaction by which every European here has lost more or less prestige. At one time Mr. Rivers Wilson virtually ruled Egypt, but not only did he act unwisely in various important matters, such as summarily discharging the unpaid officers, but he also seemed to make a point of disregarding all the customs of the country; and the feelings of many good Mussulmans were shocked by the ostentatious wearing of hats on all occasions of ceremony, and by the introduction of a brace of English pointers in the divan of the Ministry of Finance. Of course it is impossible to forecast the result, but it is probable that the Powers will let the Khedive try his new administration for a year, and if his foreign obligations are not fulfilled steps may then be taken to ensure a better government. The only encouraging fact is that the crops will be better this year than they have been for many years past.

Correspondence.

LALOR'S TRANSLATION OF ROSCHER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the number of the *Nation* of Feb. 20, 1879, there is a communication, signed "Economist," criticising the rendering of a sentence in Section VII. of Roscher's "Political Economy," translated by me. As I did not answer "Economist's" communication shortly after it appeared, I would let it rest now were it not that I have met a great many people who know nothing of my translation of the eminent professor's work but the strictures on it in "Economist's" note to the *Nation*.

The sentence referred to, as it appears in my translation, is as follows:

"In estimating the resources of a whole people it is, of course, necessary to make deduction of the debts due by the individual members of the nation to their fellow-countrymen."

The word "deduction" in the above is a misprint. By an oversight in the reading of the proof it slipped into my translation instead of the word "abstraction" in my manuscript. When "abstraction" is substituted for "deduction" the translation is correct—"to make abstraction" being equivalent, as I suppose, to "leaving out of consideration," or "considering apart" from the main subject.

The translation of "Economist's" friend is as follows:

"Who would sum up the national wealth must naturally deduct the debts owing to foreigners; those of the inhabitants between each other (he must), on the other hand, leave out of consideration."

This differs in substance from my translation. "Economist's" translation is made from the tenth or from a yet earlier edition of the original. Mine is from the thirteenth, which says nothing of "debts owing to foreigners."

I am under obligations to "Economist" for calling my attention and that of the readers of my translation to the oversight admitted above. Of the correctness of my translation of Professor Roscher's work I feel entirely confident. It was carefully compared with the original by myself, by a distinguished American scholar long familiar with the work in German, and by Professor Roscher himself, to whose acquaintance with the English language every page of his book bears witness. No pains have been spared to make the translation faithful, and the best judges have pronounced it correct.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., May 28, 1879.

JOHN J. LALOR.

WHITES AND BLACKS IN MISSISSIPPI.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I enclosed you a few days ago some extracts from our journals to show the spirit manifested here in regard to the "Kansas exodus," and also stated some facts within my personal knowledge in regard to the late labor convention, hoping they might be of use in any comments you might make on that subject. A late article (in the last number) of *Harper's Weekly* only evinces too plainly the necessity of correct information in enlightened circles when discussing this question of the negroes. The statement is made in that article, "Armed bands have assembled on the shores of the river to prevent the emigrants from embarking, and not less than twenty cases of deliberate murder have been reported." And from such loose general assertions the following fallacious conclusion is drawn: "The movement, therefore, toward the North is simply an effort of this suffering people to escape from the grossest wrong and oppression."

Living here on the river in the midst of these "armed bands" and of "grossest wrong and oppression," the only fact I can learn to justify even a shadow of ground for such assertion is that while a number of emigrants were assembled on the bank at Leota, Washington County, the sheriff with a posse of fifteen men went, at the summons of the citizens there, to prevent lawlessness and protect the property of the town from pillage by an armed band of the most notorious negroes in that neighborhood, who were drinking, parading the streets, and insulting the white people. As an evidence of the forbearance of the whites, only one arrest was made and there was no bloodshed; some of the negroes got off on the boats—those having means to pay their fare—and the rest went back to the plantations. To rebut the statement further I send you the testimony, as recorded in the *St. Louis Times-Journal*, of the officers of the boats that ply on the river, passing up and down from New Orleans to St. Louis at intervals of only about two days of each other, as well as of the officers of the Anchor Line Packet Association, whose president is a prominent Republican of St. Louis.

It is much to be desired that the enlightened writers of the North direct their investigations and discussions to the "social and economical condition" of the Southern negroes, and give greater credence and publicity to the information collected by such men as Mr. Edward Atkinson, of Boston, and others who speak from personal and careful observation on the spot. I know there is a great deal of lawlessness in the South, but surely not confined to assaults upon negroes; and there can never be any settled, contented prosperity for the negroes until their Northern friends cease to regard them as a horde, or clan, for political purposes, to be banded against their white neighbors. They must be allowed to intermingle and find their social and industrial position in the community naturally, as those of other races, dependent upon habits of frugality and usefulness.

Allow me to correct one misconception in your criticism of the Labor Convention as to the treatment by that convention of the resolutions of ex-Governor Henry S. Foote. Governor Foote was in attendance at the first day's session, when all resolutions were freely offered and referred to a committee, selected equally of both negroes and whites. Why did not Governor Foote offer his resolutions then? I have no doubt they would have been properly considered and perhaps favorably reported on. Contrary, however, to the course of every other member who had resolutions or propositions to offer, Governor Foote came in at the last hour and moved his resolutions as a substitute for the carefully-considered work of the committee, accompanying them with a political speech. This was a business meeting between planters and laborers to come to some terms of understanding—something similar to the strikes of your laborers in the North—and the firebrand of past partisan criminations and recriminations was wholly malapropos. Governor Foote represented nothing material to the meeting; an alien to both interests, he

did not receive the endorsement of the prominent representatives of either side in the convention.

BOLIVAR, MISS., May 16, 1879.

G. CLAY.

[Our correspondent encloses also the following schedule of labor contracts in vogue.]

Wages are almost unknown in making a cotton crop; laborers either work for a share in the crop, or rent land for a specified quantity of cotton per acre, or money equivalent secured by the cotton. The share system is confined usually to two forms of contract: 1. The landlord furnishes the land, implements, and mules, and feed for mules, for which as rent he receives one-half of the crop made. 2. The landlord furnishes the land—fenced, ditched, etc.—and receives one-fourth of the crop as rent, but generally has to provide mules, feed, etc., and take all the risks of outfit and crop, for which he charges at fixed rates as agreed upon. Now, when we take into consideration the quality of the labor and amount of intelligence and economic science used in the cultivation of crops, as well as the outlay, in addition, for food, clothing, etc., to be advanced the laborer from the very start, and the waste and repairs of such a system, the dissatisfaction engendered and the final overthrow of any basis of mutual prosperity are not a matter of astonishment. Let your political economists and statesmen take these problems in hand, inculcate in their "wards" the lessons of successful husbandry, and give a rest from high-sounding phrases about freedom and oppression in the diagnosis of their ills.

There is little or no disturbance in the sugar parishes, where the wages system obtains; the trouble is confined to the cotton districts, and I attribute this, in a great degree, to the vicious share system, and consequent large advances, requiring a credit which perforce must be at usurious rates, and becomes in the end a burden which crushes labor. Out of the present commotion must come a change in the system of agricultural contracts or an entirely new tenantry. At this stage of civilization the Mississippi bottoms will never be abandoned—a soil above all rich and inviting to the hand of toil.

G. C.

CO-OPERATIVE STUDY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Andrew D. White, as stated in No. 721 of the *Nation*, has recently called "attention to the need of a larger supply of men properly equipped by education for the work of legislation and administration," and has proposed "the establishment of schools or departments of political science by our leading colleges, in which such young men as choose to make politics their occupation or their leading object of attention might get an education in political economy, in the use of statistics, in finance, in general jurisprudence, and comparative legislation." But of the large numbers of young men whose ambition it is to be, and some of whom in time will be, our political leaders how many could take advantage of such schools if established? How many of our distinguished statesmen could have availed themselves of such advantages in their youth? Those who expect eventually to make politics their occupation are compelled first to follow some other pursuit which will ensure them an income, generally low, to which they must give nearly all of their time for many years, in the meanwhile devoting their odd moments to political science and political economy. This has been the preparatory course of the great body of our present and former politicians, and undoubtedly will be that of our future leaders for many years to come.

This fact being recognized, our eminent students of politics, of whom Mr. White is an example, who are really interested in the improvement of our legislation and administration, should not only aim to provide the best means of study for the few who have abundance of time and money, but, adapting themselves to circumstances, they should devise some plan, imperfect though it may be, by which they may reach the many whose situation is described above, and lend their efforts to train them in the best manner possible.

Is not the following plan practicable? Let a number of prominent professors of political science, under the leadership of some practical educator, form an association to encourage the study of the branches enumerated by Mr. White, and lay out courses which might be pursued by young men engaged at the same time in other callings. The students who might join the association should be required to return written reports of their progress from time to time, with essays on subjects assigned, and examination papers could easily be devised, to be filled out by the student at home, which would test his knowledge. Many methods of

assistance would suggest themselves to the directors. Local clubs might be organized to form libraries and facilitate study by means of lectures by members or others, and by mutual assistance. The plan should be supplemented by summer courses of lectures, not compulsory, at various colleges.

This is exactly the plan of the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle, a society for the promotion of home study in the ordinary branches, organized last summer and now in successful operation under the supervision of Rev. Dr. Vincent, of Plainfield, N. J., with several thousand students on its roll.

The advantages of such an association are apparent. Many students now studying unsystematically would be assisted; a still larger number would come under its influence to whom the knowledge gained would at some time be very useful, but who otherwise would not study at all; the instructors would discover great ability in many of the students, who could be encouraged to make a specialty of politics. And is it not probable that the impulse thus given to the study of political subjects would benefit the colleges by encouraging students to attend the schools proposed by Mr. White and the summer lectures spoken of above?

AQUIRIVULENSIS.

Notes.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS will publish immediately 'Is Life Worth Living?' by W. H. Mallock, and a New England novel, 'The Breton Mills,' by Charles J. Bellamy, author of 'A Nantucket Idyl.'—A new edition of the works of Victor Hugo, uniform in size with the Cogswell edition of 'Les Misérables,' is announced by Geo. Routledge & Sons. The same house have issued new editions of the Duke of Argyll's 'Reign of Law' and 'Primeval Man.'—Macmillan & Co. have in press a new volume of 'Historical Essays,' by Edward A. Freeman, and in preparation a work in four volumes 8vo, edited by T. H. Ward, called 'The English Poets: Selections with Critical Introductions.'—We learn from the *Academy* that a Life of the late Dr. Livingstone is in progress, under the supervision of his family, with primary reference to his personal and domestic character and missionary labors.—The latest of those special gazetteers whose compilation is designed to meet the wants of advertisers is 'The Right-hand Record and Ready Reference' (New Haven: H. P. Hubbard). Its distinguishing features are the geographical arrangement of the newspapers of the United States in the smallest compass, with indications of their politics and circulation and time of issue, and the population of the places where they are published. Adjoining these columns are blank spaces for memoranda, etc.—The third part of Oncken's 'Allgemeine Geschichte' (B. Westermann & Co.) is devoted to the Grecian section of Prof. Dr. Hertzberg's joint province of Hellas and Rome; and extends from the Pelasgic antiquity to the beginning of the Persian wars. The illustrations embrace the architectural remains of the Acropolis and the Lion Gate of Mycenæ, some of the more famous statuary of gods and demi-gods, and carved and pictorial representations of the gymnasium. These, if not always adequate, are always admirably engraved. The next instalment will take the reader to the battle of Mantinea.—Tennyson's hitherto unpublished poem, 'The Lover's Tale,' of which the first and second parts have been in private circulation for some years, is announced for early publication, with the third part, hitherto wholly unknown, and the sequel, "The Golden Supper."—Turgeneff has given through the *Paris Soleil* a *démenti* to the reports of his expulsion from Russia and subsequent proscription. This incident may well renew the caution with which news about Russia from non-Russian sources should be regarded.

—The *Chicago Tribune* of May 24 exposes the manner in which Mr. W. H. Davenport Adams composed the book called 'The Secret of Success,' which we noticed a fortnight ago. Mr. Adams had fallen in with Prof. Wm. Mathews's 'Getting on in the World,' and, deeming himself safe with the ocean between, appropriated some twenty pages of the American work, disguised by verbal alterations and interpolations, and credited, if at all, to an anonymous "acute writer" or "sensible moralist," and only once to Prof. Mathews. "Four-fifths of Mr. Adams's 'Key-Notes,' the larger and best part of the mottoes of his chapters, and scores of his most striking quotations from other authors, have been taken from the same source." This shameless proceeding, for which international copyright would furnish a remedy and redress, is all the more curious because Prof. Mathews (we believe in the case of another of his published works) was lately accused of plagiarizing from the writings

of a well-known Ohio writer on educational subjects, and was obliged to fall back on his very absorbent memory as an apology for reproducing the words and order of the original text without acknowledgment.

—*Lippincott's* for June opens with an interesting glimpse of "State and Society in Ottawa," by a writer new to us, Mr. Frederic G. Mather. The paper is prettily illustrated. Speaking of Lord Dufferin's unbounded hospitality in 1872-78, Mr. Mather says:

"A sort of democratic jollity pervaded Ottawa society. Every one who called in due form at Rideau Hall was sure to be invited, sooner or later, to some of the numerous festivities—skating, tobogganing, dancing, private theatricals, and the like. Society went crazy over this state of things, to the extent that some families in good circumstances were nearly ruined by their efforts to shine 'at the Hall.' At the same time there was no end to the number of purveyors, tailors, and other specialists 'by appointment to his Excellency.' A number of the more sober-minded in this community hold Lord Dufferin responsible for an era of extravagance which Ottawa could ill afford."

Mrs. Wister concludes her series of papers on Paris, in which the topics have apparently been selected to match the electrotype cuts; Mrs. Rebecca Harding Davis tells a new Jersey ghost-story, part of which she was; Annie Porter's 'My Village in the South,' Part IV., is enlivened by some new character-sketches and a genuine romance. The paper on "American Fiction," its material and opportunities, does not go far to explain why our school of novelists hold neither the first nor the second place among their contemporaries. In the *Monthly Gossip* a contributor makes Lady Anne Blunt's journal among the Bedouins a text for some amusing comments on English husbands, apropos of the "Wilfrid" of her narrative.

—It appears that the propositions formulated by the International Literary Congress, which assembled at Paris during the Exposition last summer, are not to be allowed to rest there. A second session of the same body has been called to meet at the rooms of the Royal Institution of Great Britain, London, from the 9th to the 16th inst. The invitations show that it is under the auspices of a society of rather slender membership as yet, an offshoot of the first Congress, the International Literary Association. The progress made in the meantime will be reviewed, and further steps taken towards carrying the approved measures into execution. Special attention, by the programme, is to be given to questions of translation and adaptation both of books and plays. The official language of the Congress is still to be French, away from home though it be, but permission is liberally accorded the orators to take the parole in their own tongues. With this condition and on British soil it is possible that American as well as British authors may attend in greater force than before, and that the Anglo-American aspect of literary matters may come in for something of the important place it occupies in a general view of the field. There cannot be many new items in any report of progress to be made by American delegates since the last meeting. The principal is perhaps the willingness shown, in a late manifesto, by a large publishing house, once supposed to be the chief obstacle in the way of an adjustment, to negotiate; and the manifesto itself may come before the Congress. It seems an opportunity to get the assistance of moderately disinterested foreign delegates in arranging a basis of accommodation which ought to be utilized.

—The formal propositions of the Congress, whose present condition and prospects will come up for review, were:

- I. The author's right to his work is not a legal grant or sufferance but a form of absolute property, which the laws should protect.
- II. The right of the author, his heirs and assigns, is perpetual.
- III. On the expiration of the term fixed for the duration of the author's rights by existing laws of the different countries his works may be freely reproduced by whoever will, on condition of payment of a consideration to his heirs or assigns.

The peculiar rights recognized as belonging to the heirs of the author shall not be construed to prevent the publication of a new edition, provided it be faithful. Such new editions shall be preceded by actual tender of indemnity, and by two unopposed notifications at an interval of six months.

IV. Every literary, scientific, or artistic work shall be accorded, in countries other than that of its origin, the same privileges as works of national origin. Dramatic and musical works are intended to be included in this provision.

V. It shall be sufficient for the author, in order to secure such protection, to have complied with the ordinary formalities in use in the country where the work is published for the first time.

VI. The Congress holds that the moral and material well-being of the literary class is intimately connected with the foundation and development of associations having for their object the defence of the author's rights, and the formation of funds for assistance and for retiring pensions.

Besides these the Congress emitted, less formally, the expressions of opinion :

1. That international treaties should reserve to the author the exclusive right to permit translations or adaptations of his work.

2. That conventions affecting literature should in future be entirely independent of treaties of commerce.

3. That the French Government should take the initiative towards an international conference in which the delegates of the respective Powers should elaborate a uniform ordinance for the management of literary property, in accordance with the sense of the resolutions adopted by this Congress.

It went on further to desire that the question of *crédit littéraire*—that is, the provision of funds for pecuniary assistance, as in lawsuits for infringements, to make loans on manuscripts accepted but not yet paid for, etc.—should be carefully studied and inscribed on the programme of the next Congress, and adopted the proposition to found an international literary society, open to the literary societies and writers of the world.

—The International Literary Association thus formed has charged itself with establishing permanent relations among the writers of the diverse countries, facilitating the general diffusion of the various literatures, and defending the principles above named. Victor Hugo continues honorary president, as he was of the Congress. An honorary committee is composed of Edmond About, Auerbach, Castelar, Turgeneff, Blanchard Jerrold, Edward Jenkins, M.P.; Mauro Macchi, Italian deputy; José da Silva Mendes Leal, minister plenipotentiary of Portugal at Paris; Torres Caicedo, minister of San Salvador at Paris; Johannes Nordman, president of the *Société des Gens de Lettres* of Austria; Jules Simon, and Gonzales, honorary president of the *Société des Gens de Lettres* of France. Blanchard Jerrold and Torres Caicedo of these, and Pierre Zaccane, a minor French novelist of the sensational school, are the organizing committee of the London conference. The association has for other objects, and has already decreed in its printed prospectus, the establishment of a library open to the works of writers of all nations, a permanent central club at Paris for the reunion of affiliated writers of all nations, the reception of communications relative to questions of literary property, the organization of lectures, and the publication of a monthly bulletin for the diffusion of a better acquaintance of the literatures among themselves. A diploma is promised to members, and a mention of such works as they may publish from time to time in the Bulletin. M. Lermina, the very active secretary, is the author, under the pseudonym of William Cobb, of various lively feuilletons in the cheap republican papers of a large circulation, like the *Petit Parisien* and the *Petit Lyonnais*.

—M. Jacques Bertillon has read before the Paris Société d'Anthropologie a curious statistical discussion of the comparative "nuptiality" of unmarried, divorced, and widowed persons. Using the returns of France (1856-65), Switzerland (1876), and the Netherlands (1856-65), he shows that the chances of marriage, as insurance writers might say, are three or four times as great for widowers as for unmarried men of the same age. Of course this is to the credit of marriage: those who have tried it like it. But one would suppose that men who had been divorced would have had enough of it, and, moreover, that women might avoid a man who had been unable to make his first marriage happy. Not so, in either case. After thirty the nuptiality of the divorced exceeds that of the single by a rapidly-increasing ratio, till at forty-five it is six times as great—greater even than that of widowers. The results for women are similar but less in amount, on which M. Bertillon makes the remark that women can get along better without us than we can without women. He also indulges himself in a little praise of his favorite statistics. No moralist or novel-writer has ever even suspected this enormous difference between the nuptiality of the widowed and the single. The knowledge of the human heart, which is the main object of half our conversation and all our literature, is after all to be found only in exact science. *Vive la Statistique!* He then goes on to show why a first marriage renders a second likely. One cause assigned is an interesting fact discovered some years ago by his father, that there is a greater mortality among celibates than among the married, and that the death-rate of widowers is still greater. Also the tendency to crime, to insanity, and to suicide is greater, as the figures show, among the single and the widowed than among the married. There are then, evidently, certain advantages in the married life, certain attractions to those who have once tried it, certain dangers and discomforts in its opposite, which suffice to explain why the chance of a man making a second marriage, if he becomes a widower, are three or four times as great as of his marrying at all. And yet the

humorists are full of scoffs at marriage, the sentimentalists are shocked at second nuptials, and the law, following an old prejudice, perhaps monastic and ecclesiastical, "looks," as the French code says, "with an evil eye upon women who remarry." Again, *vive la Statistique*, which shows how useful to society are marriage and second marriage.

—Among the more—perhaps we ought to say the most—important historical publications of the last year is the fifth edition of the first volume of Max Duncker's 'Geschichte des Alterthums' (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot). Though the new edition is designated only as "verbessert," the volume is largely rewritten. A careful comparison with the fourth edition, published in 1874, makes it apparent that the author has not only diligently exerted himself to enrich his work with the best results of critical research matured during the last few years, in reference to the early history of Egypt, Babylonia, Arabia, Phœnicia, Palestine, Armenia, and Asia Minor—to which this volume is devoted—but has also striven to enhance the value of what he has essentially left as formerly presented, by greater precision, greater fulness, and more perfect symmetry. Whether the following three volumes, of which the concluding one—ending with the reign of Darius Hystaspis—appeared in 1877, are to undergo a similarly incisive and equally speedy revision, we are not told in the new preface. The main object of the latter is briefly to justify the author's course in extensively incorporating in his history facts based on decipherments of Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions, and in some instances conflicting with the fragments of Berosus, statements of Herodotus, and the Biblical books of Kings and Chronicles, for which he was called to account in an otherwise very friendly review of the fourth edition. Those statements, however, which were criticised on account of disagreement with the authorities mentioned, belong to the second volume, and it is still to be seen whether they will not ultimately appear in a slightly modified, less positively Assyriological form.

—The writer against whose objections to his excessive faith in Assyriology Duncker finds it necessary to defend himself in the preface to his work is Alfred von Gutschmid, an eminent authority in ancient history, though not an adept in the mysteries of decipherment. His review of the first two volumes of the 'Geschichte des Alterthums,' fourth edition, appeared in the *Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie* for 1875. An earlier attack on the eagerness of Assyriologists to discover in the inscriptions points of contact with Biblical history, and on their readiness in case of discrepancy to place the discoveries, or rather conjectures, of decipherers above plain Scriptural texts, was made by the same writer in the *Literarisches Centralblatt*, in October, 1870. Eberhard Schrader, who was then preparing his work, 'Die Assyrisch-Babylonischen Keilschriften' (Leipzig, 1872), which, together with 'Die Keilschriften und das Alte Testament' (Giessen, 1872), has given him a leading position among German Assyriologists, devoted a number of pages in the former work to the defence, against Gutschmid, of the high claims of his science, politely referring to the assailant as "one of the most distinguished students of the history of the ancient Orient." Subsequently, in a review of Duncker's 'Geschichte,' in the *Jenaer Literaturzeitung*, he gave vent to his satisfaction on seeing universal history adopting the conclusions of the decipherers without hesitation. Gutschmid, on his part, in criticising Duncker in 1875, directed his objections to the methods and over-confidence of the Assyriologists mainly against Schrader. The latter hastened to write a lengthy reply, which he published in the *Jena Literaturzeitung*, October 30, 1875. This provoked Gutschmid more broadly to state his doubts as to the historical value of Assyriology in its present stage of development, which he did in a book entitled 'Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alten Orients—Die Assyriologie in Deutschland' (Leipzig, 1876). He this time treated Schrader rather severely, exhibiting him as one of the most unguarded representatives of his school. The attack was heavy in every way. Schrader immediately prepared for a new and more decisive defence of the assailed positions, and the result of his efforts is his third great publication, 'Keilschriften und Geschichtsforschung' (Giessen, 1878), which we have already noticed (*Nation*, No. 713).

—Aimée and her troupe closed a six weeks' season at Booth's and the Park on Saturday last with "Les Brigands." Very few operas have been sung, the chief novelties brought out being Lecocq's "Le Petit Duc" and Offenbach's "Madame Favart." The first of these was performed at two or three theatres in English before Aimée made her appearance in it, and it is needless to say that in French it is incomparably superior. The libretto, however, is too long for the plot, and the opera labors under the difficulty of being neither quite opéra bouffe nor quite opéra comique.

"Madame Favart" is almost as much a comedy as an opera, and was chiefly noticeable for the very remarkable acting of Mezières in the part of *Pontsablé*. The rôle of a half-imbecile and half-paralyzed old debauchee may not be the finest in the world, and we are continually surprised that such an accomplished actor as Mezières should be content to act in bouffe parts; but, inasmuch as legitimate French comedy has never flourished in this city, it is perhaps fortunate for New York audiences that he is. The music of "Madame Favart" is not Offenbach's best, nor are the airs, with two or three exceptions, marked. The voices of the *Aimée* Company, too, are few in number, and though good acting will carry off a great many defects in the way of singing, the absence of a respectable tenor created a serious deficiency. Mlle. Raphael, a new accession to the company, a young woman who, owing to her extraordinary height, appears better in men's than women's parts, supplied this defect to a certain extent, but her voice is not remarkable. The pretty and childish Mlle. Beaudet, who took the part of the *Duchesse* in "Le Petit Duc," was an accession to the troupe in the way of acting, but not of singing. Indeed, on the whole there was very little good singing, except by *Aimée*, whose voice seems to improve, as her acting certainly does. The new operatic importations from Paris show that the tendency among composers away from strictly bouffe opera still continues in force, and it is probably owing to this that so many of the best-known operas of that school, "*Barbe-Bleu*," "*La Belle Hélène*," "*La Grande Duchesse*," the "*Cent Vierges*," are now seldom sung. These were the first operas of the school ever heard in the United States, and it will be remembered that the excitement created by them was rather moral than operatic, the respectable press uniting in condemnation of them, and the mayors of self-respecting cities going to the theatre to see for themselves whether such performances ought to go on. It must now be ten years since, and for some reason or other the school is already supplanted by another which seems to be regarded as above reproach by those to whom the antics of "*Prince Paul*" and "*Madame l'Archiduc*" were anathema. Morally "*Madame Favart*" is as much to be deplored as many of the old school, but it is, we believe, considered to be an opera to which a young lady "may take her mother." Indeed, the French opera season here is getting to be such an established "institution" that scruples as to the enjoyment of it are decidedly inconvenient, and inasmuch as some of the new operas are morally unexceptionable, the fashionable world appears inclined to draw a veil over the past and to pardon whatever needs forgiveness in the present. Meanwhile the line between legitimate opera and opéra bouffe is being made less clear in another way by the appearance in the latter of regular operatic singers, particularly Capoul, who is to make his appearance here in his new profession next fall in a bouffe company which will include a sister of Irma. New York has therefore before it an unusually fine operatic future. With two regular seasons of legitimate opera at the Academy, a season of *Aimée*, a season of the Capoul-Marie troupe, to say nothing of perennial "*Pinafore*," adult and juvenile, black and white, secular and ecclesiastical, there ought next year to be no complaint on this head.

—A writer in the London *Musical Times* for March advances a "Plea for the Flute." He refers to the great antiquity of the instrument, and the feats which in Greece and elsewhere are said to have been performed upon it. The great composers, he informs us, have written much good chamber music for this instrument, and it should therefore be more generally introduced as a parlor instrument, especially in view of the fact that the piano is gradually losing its monopoly in the family circle, and many young ladies are now learning to play the violin. On several grounds this "plea" appears to us somewhat ill-advised and unnecessary. England must be very different from America if it is necessary there to plead the cause of the flute. Here the flute seems to form a sort of intermediate link between the accordion and the piano, and, owing to the ease with which it is learned, the number of players on it is legion. An amusing illustration of this is afforded by a certain orchestral society of students at a leading New England college. At the annual examination of candidates for admission four out of six are commonly equipped with flutes; and there is a tradition that in the dim past this "orchestra" once consisted of ten flutes, two violins, and a bass drum. But even if England is not thus blessed with flute-players, there is no particular reason why their multiplication should be advocated. Some of the older masters have indeed written concerted music for the flute, but from the time of Haydn the habit of so doing has become less and less frequent. The reason is not far to seek. Although the flute is not a positively vulgar instrument, like the melodramatic cornet, which moves the primitive emo-

tions of the unæsthetic public, it yet lacks, to a great extent, those qualities which combine to make a first-rate musical instrument. The flute, one might say, has no soul, and differs in this respect most widely from the cello and the horn with their intensely emotional tones. Scientifically, Helmholtz has shown that this difference depends on the number and relative height of the harmonic overtones which accompany every simple musical sound; and he alludes to the old *bon mot* that to a musical ear nothing is more dreadful than a concerto for the flute, excepting a concerto for two flutes. In the orchestra the flute is not only tolerable but even valuable for the production of shrill, demonic effects on the high notes, or of sweet and calm pastoral effects on the lower notes. But for chamber music, where only a few instruments are used, the flute is too dreary and monotonous to be of any great value, since it lacks the lower overtones, and its power of dynamic expression is too limited. The neglect of this instrument in chamber music by modern composers is therefore simply an illustration of the eliminating action of natural selection; and all the eloquence of the *Musical Times* will not suffice to make a law of æsthetic evolution turn back on itself, and revert to a state of primitive simplicity à la Rousseau.

—In accordance with the hint thus afforded us, young men and women should be urged to bestow their time and labor rather on the bowed instruments than the flute. An abundant crop of amateur string-quartet clubs will be the best means of gradually raising ourselves to the rank of a musical nation. Unfortunately there are several great difficulties in the way of such clubs. Violin-players are easily enough obtained in any town, but it is almost impossible to secure respectable performers on the viola and the cello. The ambitious, "democratic" spirit of young Americans makes them all aspire to play the first fiddle, and thus the other instruments of the quartet are neglected. This difficulty will gradually disappear as the knowledge gains ground that in the best music harmony is even a more essential factor than melody, and that, moreover, in modern music the melody is not so exclusively assigned to the highest part as it was in the days of Haydn and Pleyel. On the other hand, amateurs are apt to be discouraged by the inherent difficulties of most chamber music, especially that of Beethoven, Schumann, and Rubinstein. In such cases it is best to leave classic music alone for the time being, and get some of the operatic potpourris for one, two, or three string instruments and piano, published, *e. g.*, in the Edition Peters in a comfortable and very cheap form. Operatic potpourris do not belong to the highest class of music, we grant, but neither do they deserve the supreme contempt which many pedantic music-teachers affect for them. They will serve as a means of elevating the taste of those to whom the highest forms of composition are as yet unintelligible; and they will also be the means of saving from oblivion many of those beautiful melodies which occur in operas that are now no longer tolerated on the stage. It would surely be a pity to throw away all these jewels together with the perishable stuff in which they were originally set. Arranged in an artistic manner they will give pleasure to the most refined musician, who would shudder at the mere thought of having his ears and intellect tortured by the stupid text and the miles of dry and meaningless recitative amidst which these fine melodies were for a long time buried.

THE FINE ARTS OF THE ITALIAN RENAISSANCE.*

MR. SYMONDS'S work consists now of three volumes, and there is promise of a fourth, to be devoted to Italian literature; the first volume, historical and preliminary in character, entitled "Age of the Despots," has already been reviewed in these columns.† Two years ago appeared the two volumes severally entitled "The Revival of Learning" and "The Fine Arts"; it is the second of these which is now republished, printed from the English plates with the addition of brief notes from author and publisher, and—what each of the English volumes sadly needs—an index. The volume is in many ways fitted for separate issue as an account of the state of the fine arts during an important and critical epoch. Much information otherwise widely scattered and to be sought for within the covers of many books, old and new, is here put together in a readable shape. The results of late archaeological research and of recent critical examinations into historical authorities and monuments of art are here given with sufficient thoroughness. The whole book, indeed, is composed in the light of the most modern knowledge and opinion, and is quite free from the legendary story-telling tone, as if of a transcript from Vasari, which has injured some well-intending books lately pub-

* "Renaissance in Italy. The Fine Arts. By John Addington Symonds." New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1879.
† The Nation, vol. xxi. p. 249 (Oct. 14, 1875).

lished. The first chapter is devoted to an attempted contrast between the classical and the Christian spirit as embodied in fine art, and a statement of the inevitable protest of piety and of ascetic religion against representative art of any form, and peculiarly against its more developed forms. The author carries his argument far, and endeavors to show that all intense religious feeling, whether monastic or puritan in character, must share in this distrust of an art which draws its inspiration from the beauty and glory of this world. The purely classical and pagan development of the later years of the Renaissance is in this manner characterized as inevitable; while the original character of the artistic revival as a "return in all sincerity and faith to the glory and gladness of nature, whether in the world without or in the soul of man," is strongly insisted on. As these considerations stand in Mr. Symonds's pages the assertions seem a little abrupt, a little uncompromising; and yet they are evidently the result of mature deliberation, and, that they may seem so, lack only the statement of the drawbacks and of the qualifying exceptions.

Chapters second and third are devoted to an examination of architecture and sculpture in Italy, as developed during the latter part of that short period during which the Gothic style prevailed in the peninsula—a period shortened at both ends, beginning later and ending sooner than in Northern Europe—and as passing through different manifestations down to the time of Cellini. These are interesting chapters; the account of the earliest work of the Pisani is particularly good; and the few words said of those unique buildings, neither Gothic nor classic in style, the lovely first-fruits of a natural and non-classical renaissance, destroyed almost in its commencement by the revival of classical learning, are good and right, although the full significance of those works of art, perhaps, escapes our author. This, however, is preliminary; the real purpose of the volume, as proclaimed in the first chapter, is to dwell upon painting as the one fine art peculiarly suited to the genius and to the circumstances of the Italian revival, and, therefore, carried to a perfection not equalled at other times and places. Two-thirds of the volume is devoted to Italian painting, with occasional episodes, as when Michael Angelo's life is related, at perhaps disproportional length, and Cellini's whimsical and violent acts are used to explain certain moral aspects of the Renaissance rather than to aid in any way the enquiry into the progress of art.

This book so constituted has the merits and the defects of a treatise by a literary man and student upon those strange, non-literary arts which are apt to baffle analysis and to contradict theories, and to lead the explorer on into no-thoroughfares of inference. This volume, like the previous volumes, is a collection of essays of very unequal value. That devoted to Cellini is little more than an abstract of his life and adventures, and the occasional remarks on his work are very inadequate; nor is this to be wondered at, for the art of Cellini was almost wholly decorative and, in a sense, technical, nor can its value be evident to one who views it from the standpoint of a literary taste. It is easy for a critic trained as Mr. Symonds appears to have been to despise such art as Cellini's. That Mr. Symonds does not despise it is a proof of the patient and self-distrusting mood in which, to his great credit, he is content to remain; that he should treat it adequately is too much to expect. The essay on Michael Angelo is more valuable, because of the more visible sentiment and more impressive imaginative character of that great artist's work. A student, not particularly of plastic art, but of human thought in general however embodied, can see, or partly see, the meaning of Buonarrotti—can love and admire splendid imaginings, vast, dreamy thoughts, only half expressed in rough-hewn marble, stately impersonations in cool frescos on shadowy vaults. But in this essay, as well as in all the chapters devoted to painting, it is the historical view that is of value—the well-arranged and well-worded account of the rise and fall of schools of art, the abstract of interesting facts not indeed inaccessible to the student, not remote, not now for the first time put into shape, but still out of the way of the ordinary reader of history, who by this means has put into his hands such an account of this embodiment of human activity as he needs to have by him when reading Sismondi, or Michelet, or Burckhardt.

The almost complete subordination of the other graphic arts to painting asserted in the earliest pages and maintained throughout is to be regretted; if for no other reason, yet for this one, that a ready way of comparing the spirit of the Renaissance with that of the Greeks was thus left untried. Some attempt at this there is, indeed, in chap. i. Nor do we forget, nor even for a moment ignore, the immense difficulty of the task of conveying in words such an impression as would be at once accurate and intelligible of this subtle distinction. Another and perhaps equally important comparison, that between architec-

ture and all decorative arts in the Middle Ages and after the revival, we miss and regret. On page 4 a very brief and summary statement of the universality of decoration in the fifteenth century in Italy leaves a false impression upon the mind of those readers for whom, as we have seen, this book is specially intended. The student who is not an artist, nor especially occupied in the enjoyment and examination of fine art, nor surrounded by its influence, needs to be told that this splendid abundance of ornamental art is not peculiar to the nation nor to the time. In a literal sense the Renaissance was heir of all the ages. The stone-carving, the wall-painting, the iron-forging, the bronze-chasing, the enamelling, the engraving, the illuminating, the stamping of leather, which was being done in the Italian cities when Giotto was alive and active, leads up to that of one hundred years later when Brunelleschi was alive and active, and so on to that of still a century later when Buonarrotti was of middle age and Cellini was in his youth. It will be worth somebody's while to show how the arts of decoration centring in architecture and supremely affected by it are the same, and yet not the same, in 1320 and in 1520; to show how classical sculpture, dug from the ground, and classical fable, found in newly-deciphered manuscript, had given a new meaning to the details of ornament, while leaving for a long course of years its essential nature, its value, its decorative purpose unchanged. Mr. Symonds's book gives us nothing of all this, nor is that very surprising nor greatly to be regretted; it is recorded here as a necessary part of its characterization.

It must be repeated that, untechnical and exoteric as is the author's view of fine art, there are yet sound conclusions to which he has come. He has had good tutors, and has known how to choose his advisers well, and to give credence to the credible. The pages before page 20 are very safe—they might be read to a class of pupils, and even required of them as a lesson to learn by heart; after years of casting about and doubt and changing opinions, it is to such views as these that one comes at last. The valuable essays by Mr. Pater seem to be inspired by a more intense love of fine art and a more intimate knowledge of it, and yet for an accurate general statement of certain broad truths Mr. Symonds's preliminary remarks are perhaps unmatched by anything in the pages of his more minutely-informed fellow-student. In like manner, although one must go to Bryce's 'History of the Holy Roman Empire' for the shrewdest insight into the use and meaning of architectural remains, and for the reason why there is no mediæval architecture in Rome; although one is driven to the second volume of the 'Stones of Venice' for an adequate account of Italian Gothic architecture—that misunderstood, much-beloved and vilified, wholly contradictory and wholly delicious art, misconceived by the architectural critics, and left to Ruskin's poetical hyperbole for a characterization right in spirit if vague in form; although Mr. Symonds leads us into labyrinths of speculation in such passages as the attempted comparison (p. 312) between Correggio, Raphael, Leonardo, and Michael Angelo, with fanciful epithets for each, and is certainly less successful in special critical remarks than in the broadest general conclusions, yet it cannot but be considered a gain to have such just views of the whole field put into these simple and readable chapters.

After all, however, the volume on the 'Revival of Learning' is the best of the three. If the mysteries of artistic criticism are not wholly revealed to our author—as how should they be—the truths of literature and scholarship are much more open to his observation, and he is not a careless observer of them. His gift of historical research seems to be excellent, and in a department in which he is a lifelong student and a practical workman—that of scholarly literature—he speaks like one at home on his subject, weightily and with authority. The volume on the 'Revival of Learning' is still, like the others, a collection of detached essays rather than a connected narrative—rather than a logical and consecutive body of reasoning. The historical order is the favorite one; this lecturer, that translator, and then this collector and his librarian are to pass before us in their order, and each is to have his share of critical remark and to receive credit for what he did to help along the revival. Perhaps one might prefer the reverse of this—perhaps the share of prominent individuals is a little overrated in these pages; and one longs sometimes for a narrative of the tendencies of the age and the thoughts of the great body of scholars, illustrated by the appearance now and then of some great name in which these tendencies and these thoughts seem to find strong expression. But this is a mere hard judgment of the book because it is not something else—a bad kind of criticism. The volume as it is is valuable and instructive, and leads one to wish that the volume on the Fine Arts were the fruit of as much experience and practical knowledge as it is of long research, careful and patient thought, and sincere devotion to historical and critical truth.

RECENT NOVELS.*

WE suppose that such novels as 'Airy Fairy Lillian' are to be philosophically regarded as a reaction from the 'Jane Eyre' style of story, in which the reader is called on to sympathize in the intense mental struggles and grim determinations of plain women. Molly Bawn, and more especially A. F. Lillian (we really cannot reiterate this extremely silly title), are very young, very pretty women with unlimited capacity for flirtation, the description of which makes the staple of both books; in this instance occupying one hundred and fifty solid pages with what is little more than "marking time." There is small attempt at anything like development of character. Lillian is a pretty, luxurious, petted child, and the other personages have no other *raison d'être* but to admire, indulge, and make love to her. The book opens with a description of Lillian's grief and wrath when, at her father's death, his estate passes to a distant cousin. She sees no reason why she should leave the house, and vehemently argues that she can stay there in one wing while the heir inhabits the rest of the house. She consents, finally, to live with her guardian's mother, Lady Chetwoode; her guardian, Sir Guy Chetwoode, naturally falls in love with her "dazzling skin, creamy round arms, silky yellow hair, hands like snowflakes," etc., etc., etc. All the men who see Lillian fall madly in love with her, unless they are protected by some previous attachment, and after teasing, insulting, and generally mistreating her lover, Lillian marries Sir Guy and the story is done. We should not omit to say that the drama is enacted in the midst of "huge bowls of roses," "great silver urns," and trailing velvet dresses; that Lillian, when cross, throws Dresden china cups on the floor to relieve her feelings, and that there is a pervading sense of wealth and luxury throughout the book.

'High-Water Mark' is a very complicated and intricate story, notwithstanding the suggestion of simplicity given by the motto on the title-page. He (or she, the author's name gives no clue to the appropriate pronoun) takes no flight into aristocratic or foreign society, but testifies of what he has seen and known in his own land, and if the result is not altogether attractive, if American manners and life generally have an appalling crudity in the story, possibly their prototypes might be fairly taxed with the same. There is a great deal of conversation in the book in various styles—e.g., the comic, "'You think you're dreadful smart, Frederic Lynne.' 'Why, sis, who'd 'a thought you'd have spoke!'" Another style—the cheerful domestic—is as follows: "'You are not to trouble yourself about what the Bible does not say. It says enough for everybody's salvation if they choose to accept it.' 'Or for everybody's damnation if they don't,' said Fred. 'If we could clearly understand about the judgments spoken of in the Bible,' interposed Wilma," etc., etc. The main thread of the story consists of the life and adventures of two lawyers named Burr Courtenay and Charles Burns, who wait for clients, speculate in land, write verses which are insufferable trash, flirt mildly and confusedly, try politics, go to the war, and have unlimited high converse with each other, until finally one of them is frozen to death while driving with the other. Extreme *Langsamkeit* is the sensation most vivid in the reader's mind, but suddenly he finds the description of the storm, of Courtenay's death, and of Burns's conduct in the crisis forcible and simple, and he shuts the book recalling the bird-fancier's dictum: "One or two notes nightingale and the rest rubbish."

'Falconberg' is the story of the adventures of a young Norwegian who is driven from Norway by his father's unkind treatment, and also by misconduct of his own, he having in a moment of excitement forged his father's name. He comes to America, and, after some wanderings, reaches by chance a settlement of Norwegians, "put down in the official postal guide as Pine Ridge, but known to the settlers of Viking descent as Hordanger." Here he accidentally meets a robust and liberal settler, named Nils Amundson Norderud, who takes him (under an assumed name) to his house, where he treats him hospitably and exerts himself to find occupation for the stranger. Falconberg, or rather Finnson, becomes the organist in the little Norwegian church whereof his uncle, the Rev. Falconberg, is pastor. How he establishes himself, makes friends, falls in love, edits a newspaper, goes into politics, is a candidate for the legislature but is defeated by the inopportune disclosure of his former forgery and present false name, we are told in detail. All is condoned

by friends and lady-love, and he joins Nils Norderud in the endeavor to Americanize the Norwegians. Their success is indicated by the description of a grand steamboat excursion and picnic of a dreadful nature, and we leave the hero with the best of hopes. Mr. Boyesen has remarkable facility in English, though his desire to be idiomatic leads to the occasional use of phrases which are not consonant with his usually good style.

As every effect presupposes a cause, it is clear that Madame Charles Reybaud had some reason for writing 'A Thorough Bohémienne.' It is charitable to suppose further that her reason was not a mere desire to add to the list of novels already in the world. Making this supposition, therefore, we have endeavored conscientiously to imagine why this book should have been written. As far as we can detect any idea whatever at the bottom of the plot, the intention of the author was to describe a gipsy girl rescued from gipsy life, yet so thoroughly wild *au fond* that she drifts back to her native condition by the law of her existence. This is well enough as an idea, but it is obviously in itself neither exciting nor new. It is an idea with which not a few poets and novelists, and many writers on prison discipline and penal reform, have made us familiar, and as an abstract truth of human nature had been quite as well stated by Mary Carpenter as it was ever likely to be by Madame Reybaud. The only excuse for making it the subject of a novel would be the interest or beauty of the treatment. If the gipsy were a particularly attractive gipsy, the struggle between her wild nature and the "sweet influences" of civilization, particularly if the latter took the shape of love and gratitude and other pleasing human sentiments, might become very interesting. But in the conflict raging in the breast of a rather unattractive gipsy, who is surrounded by decidedly stupid people, it is impossible to enlist the feelings of the most willing reader. Madame Reybaud's Bohémienne is the daughter of a travelling mountebank, and is taken up and adopted by the Kerbsjeans, a family possessing a château in Brittany. This family consists of the pretty Irene, her father the count, and the chevalier, an uncle of the count. The count is afflicted early in the book with intemperate habits, but these wear off as the story progresses. At one time he is very fond of Mimi, and apparently means to marry her; afterwards he seems to forget all about this. Mimi is of course in love with a man she cannot marry, and the man whom she cannot marry is in love with Irene. Notwithstanding these materials for a tragedy there is nothing very tragic about the story, which all ends in smoke. At the first blush we should have said that this must be Madame Reybaud's first novel, but we see from the title-page that she has written another. This would seem to indicate that her novels find readers, and if they do we must offer her our warmest congratulations.

'The Barque Future' is a tale of Finnish and Lapland life, translated from the Norwegian by Mrs. Ole Bull. It is a fresh, pleasant story, with genuine local color, quite refreshing among the many ineffectual efforts after original representation which result only in a distorted commonplace. 'Out of His Reckoning' is an absurd book; 'At a High Price' fairly clever, but disagreeable to our notions, as the chief love-affair is between an uncle and his niece, who is also his ward. 'Signing the Contract' describes a region concerning which we sympathize with the late lamented Betsey Prig—we don't believe there is no such place, though it is called the United States. 'The Secret of the Andes' is a book to enchant a boy: buried treasures, witches, murderers, a mysterious virgin queen, and a mountain that thunders responsively to any very "tall talk"; venal viceroys, and gold by the thousand ounces, all assist in the plot, and it is impossible to say that there may not be historical truth in the descriptions of conspiracy and revolution. The scene is laid in Quito, and dated 1592.

The Life and Letters of Frances Baroness Bunsen. By Augustus J. C. Hare. In two volumes. (New York: George Routledge & Sons, 1879.)—This is a memoir which no reader will feel disposed to approach in a critical spirit, and yet it is difficult to find in its contents any justification of its appearance. Made up as it is chiefly of the letters of the Baroness Bunsen, with a running narrative and explanation furnished by Mr. Hare, whose editorial function is little more than that of a cho-

* 'A Thorough Bohémienne.' By Madame Charles Reybaud. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879. (New Handy Volume Series.)

* 'The Barque Future; or, Life in the Far North.' By Jonas Lie. Translated by Mrs. Ole Bull. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1879.

* 'Out of His Reckoning.' By Florence Marryat. Boston: A. K. Loring.

* 'At a High Price.' From the German of E. Werner, author of 'Good Luck,' 'Vincita,' etc. Translated by Mary Stuart Smith. Author's edition. Boston: Estes & Lauriat. 1879.

* 'Signing the Contract, and What it Cost.' By Martha Finley. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.

* 'The Secret of the Andes: A Romance.' By F. Hassaurek, author of 'Four Years among Spanish-Americans.' Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1879.

* 'Airy Fairy Lillian: A Novel.' By the author of 'Phyllis,' 'Molly Bawn,' etc. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1879.

* 'High-Water Mark: A Novel.' By Ferris Jerome. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1879.

* 'Falconberg.' By Hjalmar H. Boyesen, author of 'Goethe and Schiller,' 'Gunnar,' etc. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

rus, it must stand or fall upon the merits of the correspondence; and though these give ample proof on every page of an excellent character and warm heart, they can hardly be supposed, even by those most interested in them, to have any literary value. Indeed, looking over the distinguished list of contemporaries whose names appear in the index, and who were friends and acquaintances of Baron von Bunsen and his wife, it is surprising to find in the correspondence so few traces of intellectual or sentimental impressions derived from contact and intercourse with them. We have had the curiosity to examine the references in detail, and the result has been almost depressing. For instance, to take a few well-known names quite at random: On November 19, 1840, Madame Bunsen writes to her intimate friend Abeken a letter in which she mentions having made the acquaintance of Agassiz; to identify him she describes him as "the naturalist"; this is all. In a letter to her son Theodore, dated August 19, 1865, she asks whether he ever met Ampère, and adds the characteristic sentence: "His was a singular and most engaging personality, and his death in the spring of this year struck me as cutting off another portion of the *Past* which deserves to live and will live in memory." In vol. ii. p. 105 Andersen is mentioned. He "read to us in the evening some of his own tales, and though, being translated into German, they could not produce the effect they must have in the original, we found them delightful." At page 440 of the same volume is a reference to Bismarck, and this does contain a critical remark which, however, we are bound to say is not put forward as original, and with which our readers are probably already tolerably familiar—to the effect that Bismarck had adopted the excellent plan of telling the truth for the purpose of accomplishing the same end other diplomatists attain by falsehood. This politically useful habit the excellent woman in her devout old age does not forget, with charming *naïveté*, to thank God for. We might go through the whole book in this way, and should consider ourselves very fortunate if in both volumes together we found five pages in reference to any of these contemporaries, however brilliant or renowned, of any general interest.

The fact is that Madame Bunsen, evidently remarkable as she was for the strength and beauty of her character, was not intellectually great, and had as a letter-writer none of that charm of style or faculty of description which makes the correspondence of women so often delightful reading. Her letters consist mainly either of dry details of fact, or semi-moral, semi-religious homilies addressed to her husband or other members of her family; or else letters written in the intimacy of married life which ought not to have been printed at all. What possible interest the public can be supposed to take in the descriptions given by Madame Bunsen in her letters to her mother of the appearance, health, size, etc., of her infant children we cannot imagine, and yet a considerable part of these volumes is taken up with matters of this sort. Many of the letters are letters announcing deaths, or letters of condolence written on learning the news of deaths of near relatives. What business these have in print it is impossible to understand.

The most interesting parts of the book are those describing the childhood of Baroness Bunsen. The first chapter, on "Family Influences," is written by Mr. Hare, who, if he is apt to be a little too much overcome with the solemnity of his task, does not forget that his first duty is to his readers. These "family influences" were somewhat peculiar. Madame Bunsen was collaterally descended from Mary Granville (Mrs. Delany), great-granddaughter of that Sir Beville Granville who fell in the battle of Lansdowne Heath, in 1643, with the patent of the earldom of Bath in his pocket. The early history of Mary Granville was, as Mr. Hare says, "a romance and a tragedy." At seventeen she was married against her will by her uncle, Lord Lansdowne (the friend of Pope and Swift), who desired to strengthen his political connection in Cornwall, to a Mr. Pendarves, a man of disagreeable temper and appearance, intemperate habits, and sixty years of age. By him she was carried off to Cornwall, where she was forced to take up her abode "in his dark, disagreeable, desolated castle, in which her head could not reach to the bottom of the windows." Her husband is described as having been almost always intoxicated, and when sober violently jealous, although his wife was a pattern of fidelity and submissive devotion. After two years of wretchedness he took her to London, where she was doomed to the constant companionship of his sister, who hated her. At length, after seven years of this married life, her husband died, and a will was found to have been made by him in his wife's favor; it was, however, unfortunately unsigned. Later in life she married Dr. Delany, and did not die until 1788, at the age of eighty-eight. It was the great-niece and adopted daughter of this lady who, about 1790, married Mr. Ben-

jamin Waddington; and Frances Waddington, Baroness Bunsen, born in 1791, was the child of this marriage. According to Mr. Hare there were only two points of resemblance in the disposition of her father and mother—generosity and a scrupulous regard for truth. Extremely phlegmatic, Mr. Waddington "was without the slightest particle of imagination." He was a great reader, but "had no preference with regard to subject," and "kept no particular object in view. He would steadily read for hours with the most perfect satisfaction, and never appeared to skip a single page. Whatever work he began he regularly finished, and he seldom made the slightest comment upon it. Travels, biographies, and also works of fiction were perused with the same patient attention." Mr. Waddington's "time for conversation" was after dinner, a time which he selected to inform his wife of anything that had occurred during the day "either to interest or annoy him." In his wife, who was in every way a remarkable woman, he evidently had great confidence. "For some time he troubled and worried himself with farming, but finding that it did not increase his happiness, and very much interfered with his comfort to see everything going wrong, he gradually put his agricultural affairs into the hands of his wife, who, among other useful arts, had acquired a practical knowledge of the subject, and soon succeeded in establishing order and neatness in the farming department." Among other peculiarities he had "a peculiar aversion to the expenditure of any avoidable small sum," and did not make any concealment of the fact "that the payment of turnpikes was an object of consideration which often turned the balance against sending to the post-office." On one occasion he is said to have lost several thousand pounds from his determination to save the postage of a letter of enquiry as to the payment of a policy of insurance.

Chapter ii. contains some interesting "Recollections of Childhood" in the home of her parents at Llanover in Wales, put down by Baroness Bunsen in her eighty-third year, for the benefit of her daughters and granddaughters, from which Mr. Hare gives copious extracts. This and the next chapter, "Home Life at Hanover," are the best in the books, and make up, to a certain extent, for much subsequent tediousness.

The life of Baroness Bunsen after her marriage was not eventful, though it must have been both interesting and agreeable. Moving from capital to capital as her husband rose in favor with the court at Berlin, she lived the life of the wife of an accomplished and successful diplomat, occupied chiefly with her social and domestic duties. Her correspondence makes it clear that one of the marked traits of her character was caution, and it is this caution—which such a career was hardly likely to dissipate—that makes her correspondence so uninteresting. With the exception of her strong expressions of feeling as a wife and mother—and these we must be permitted to believe she could not have intended to be printed for the benefit of the public—she never throws aside her reserve. We are never allowed to know how the men and women with whom she was constantly thrown really thought and acted. Indeed, we doubt if Madame Bunsen herself ever knew. She never had much taste for analysis of character. People were for her simply divided into those she approved or disapproved (generally for reasons with which religion and the state were closely connected), and those whom she liked or went through life without liking (for her principles prevented her from ever being a "good hater"). The *fonds* of her character was really religion, and we fear that these volumes will not be likely to be received by the world as demonstrating that a life founded upon a religious basis so strong as to absorb most other impulses can be made a source of much literary interest.

The Natural Resources of the United States. By J. Harris Patton. (New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879. 18mo, pp. ix. 115.)—Designed both for a class-book and for general readers, and published by a house which aims at accuracy, both statistical and critical, in its current series of primers, this little book invites careful examination. The compiler has aimed to give a brief physical account of the country and of its productions. The best part of his work is the description of metals and minerals, of iron, coal, lignite, gold, and silver, of building marbles and of timber. About concrete and tangible things Mr. Patton is, for the most part, concisely statistical and descriptive. Occasionally, too, he finds room for bits of curious information, as where, for instance, speaking of copper-mining in the upper peninsula of Michigan, he tells us that the pure copper there found is "from its very pureness more difficult to obtain in quantities that can be handled than that which is smelted from ore. First the mass must be dislodged by tremendous blasts of gunpowder or some explosive. But copper does not break to pieces by the explosion.

It only tears; and then it must be cut away by long chisels." But now we must notice some serious misstatements. Mr. Patton shortens the coast-line of Europe, for instance, and extends that of the United States. The respective figures are well known, and with at least approximate accuracy. The ratio of the European coast-line to the continental area is given by M. Reclus as one linear to one hundred and ninety-two square miles, or, including Great Britain and the larger islands of Europe, as one to one hundred and forty-three; Guyot's estimate is one to one hundred and eighty. Mr. Patton, mentioning no authorities, assigns to Europe the low ratio of one to two hundred and twenty-four; while for the United States, on the other hand, he finds the more favorable ratio of "one mile of shore-line to one hundred and thirty-one miles of surface." How is this pleasing result obtained? By counting the banks "of the Mississippi and its tributaries, ten thousand miles, as coast-line"; the banks of European rivers not being counted at all in making the corresponding estimate for Europe. The actual coast-line ratio for the United States, allowing one thousand miles for the south shores of the great lakes, is about one to two hundred and thirty-two. Mr. Patton's patriotic statistics remind one of Matthew Arnold's description of the provincial spirit, "with its settled misconception of the value of one's own things." What should be said of a perversion of figures we will not stop to say.

Even more inaccurate is Mr. Patton's estimate of the arable land in the United States. Professor Whitney and other students of our physical geography consider the central mountain region—the "Cordillera," as Professor Whitney proposes calling it—of the United States and Territories as amounting to nearly one-third of the whole area. This vast mountain country includes Montana, the Black Hills of Dakota, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, the Sierras of California, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and the mountain ranges of Oregon and of Washington Territory. Though in this region there are some arable valleys, by far the greater part of it is too much elevated and too poorly watered ever to support an agricultural population. Turning now to Mr. Patton, we read that "with the exception of a few rough mountains, nearly all of which are storehouses of the metals and coal, there is scarcely an acre throughout this wide domain that cannot be cultivated so as to pay liberally the laborer's hire." It would not be easy to get farther away from the facts than this. Jeffrey was blamed for "speaking disrespectfully of the equator," and we do not wish to slight the Cordillera; but the truth is that, while parts of it are suited for grazing, it can never be "cultivated." The non-arable region, which Mr. Patton calls "scarcely an acre," is in fact an area of nearly a million square miles; a region which repeats in its extremes of climate, its elevation, its lack of irrigation, and its consequent infertility, the important features of the wastes of Central Asia.

It would seem hard to make a more serious error than this in the physical description of a country; and yet Mr. Patton has done it in this little primer. He repeats the popular misinformation about *sanitaria* for invalids, recommending for consumptives the climate of Aiken, S. C., as "mild, healthy, and balmy during the winter"; that of Asheville, N. C., as "mild, dry, and equable"; and that of Minnesota as "bracing, never debilitating." This is ground upon which the inexpert shall not enter with our approval. It is a question for the climatologist and for the pathologist; and by them it has already been settled, to the following effect: that the coast climate of Southern California is the only climate within the national boundaries that is either "mild" or "equable," as compared with the Gulf Stream climates, during any one of the four seasons—the only American climate that can be recommended, as such, to consumptives. This is not the occasion to give the proofs of this statement at length, but they may be found by comparing the researches of Dove with the excellent and serviceable tables of American "Temperatures" and "Rainfall" compiled by Mr. C. A. Schott for the Smithsonian Institution. Mr. Patton should have said with more distinctive clearness than he has said that the coast climate of Southern California is a good one for persons affected with pulmonary complaints, being mild, equal, and equable the whole year round.

Petrus Martyr, der Geschichtsschreiber des Weltmeeres. Eine Studie von Hermann A. Schumacher. Mit einer Karte aus dem Jahre 1510. (New York: E. Steiger. 1879.)—A work on Peter Martyr, the earliest historian of America, can scarcely fail to excite deep interest, especially since it is the first of its kind. Peter Martyr, who was born February 2, 1455, at Arona, on the shores of the Lago Maggiore, is but rarely mentioned at present, although history is greatly indebted to his versatile pen. When Washington Irving wrote the 'Life and Voyages of Christopher

Columbus' he freely drew from Martyr's writings, as did Alexander von Humboldt and Prescott, Raumer and Ranke, and many others. The book now before us does not profess to be a biography, although its title might encourage this belief. The author merely calls it a study, and a study it is; one evincing great care, thoroughness, and immense application. It chiefly consists of two parts: the first and minor part treating of "Martyr's historical works"; the second, of "Martyr's development as a historian." Whatever views one may hold as to historical methods, it must be admitted that Dr. Schumacher has accomplished his task in an extremely satisfactory manner, and not without artistic skill, although we might have expected a little more uniformity in the treatment of the subject. The great historical events of the latter part of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century are worked into a harmonious background for the figure of Peter Martyr, who stands out in bold relief and in vivid colors. We see him leave his native country, following the Spanish ambassador, Íñigo Lopez de Mendoza, to the court of Saragossa, where he arrived during that fermenting epoch when the Spanish fleet, in rapid succession, discovered new tracts of coast-line, where the daring adventurers found new tribes of men, strange birds and beasts, pearls and precious metals, and a tropical vegetation of luxurious splendor. Induced by Queen Isabella, the Italian accepted the position of Latin Secretary at the royal court, and thenceforth Pietro Martire de Anghiera became Petrus Martyr Anglerius. During the first years of his sojourn in Spain he followed his sovereigns to the battle-field, and for some time was seriously in doubt whether to remain faithful to the pen or to exchange it for the more formidable sword. The temptation was great indeed; but it was to his first love that he clung and thereby ensured his immortality. By assuming the garb of the priest the bonds uniting him to science were firmly riveted.

His career as an author dates from his stay in Spain, where he began to write his letters on Cristóbal Colon and those upon the sea, to the latter of which he owes the epithet "the Historian of the Great Ocean." His first work on the New World was not published until 1516. It consisted of thirty parts, or three decades, and it was dedicated by its author, who had reached the age of some three-score, to the youthful Charles V., who had just ascended the throne. A book of this kind could not but create an intense sensation, for all it contained was novel, and it may truly be said that the three "decades" of writings embraced two decades of history, such as gave new life to stagnating Europe. Four or five years elapsed ere the fourth series of decades were issued, which did not prove less successful; but they were the last works published during the author's life. In 1526 his pen rested for ever. A tablet in the cathedral of Granada, erected in his memory, duly sets forth the merits of the former dean and counsellor of state; and good care was taken not to forget to mention the circumstance that Martyr was a foreigner.

In judging Martyr's position as a historian we cannot for a moment be in doubt as to his rank. His merits are great. They can, indeed, scarcely be too highly spoken of, for, had it not been for his exertions, our knowledge of America from the time of its discovery up to the year 1511 would be limited to a few insignificant facts. Nevertheless he was only a narrow-minded savant of the Latin school, who in his writings sets forth the facts as they were communicated to him, almost entirely without comment. Had he not somewhat idealized his subject he would have been untrue to his Romanic origin. When he wrote the "Decades" his task was not only that of the historian but also that of the geographer; for the conditions were such that the two offices could hardly be separated. In his time scarcely any one who laid claim to a thorough education could doubt the spherical shape of the earth; for those who were not familiar with the cosmological views then dominating could never have understood Dante (comp. "Inferno," cant. xxxiv. v. 118, and "Paradiso," cant. i. v. 43-46). "Martyr," writes Dr. Schumacher privately in response to an enquiry of ours, "neither thought of Dante, nor had he any great cosmological ideas; unfortunately he had neither seen Juan de la Cosa nor Amerigo Vespucci: he was not even familiar with the letter written by Vespucci on the 18th of July, 1500." This must appear the more characteristic of Martyr, inasmuch as Columbus when he returned from his second voyage did not hesitate to pronounce the earth pear-shaped (comp. Navarrete, 'Coleccion,' tom. i. p. 227). We learn further that the aim of the present study was not to draw any conclusions, but merely to show how far Martyr's knowledge extended, and that it is merely preliminary to a more extensive work on La Cosa. We sincerely hope that Dr. Schumacher may soon find sufficient leisure to carry out his intention. It would indeed be a splendid task to compare the cosmological views of La Cosa with those of Vespucci and Columbus, to point

out how eminently vague and shallow the ideas of the latter were, and to give Vespucci his share of the credit so long withheld from him. Meantime we earnestly commend this solid monument of well-directed scholarship.

Dickens's Dictionary of London, 1879: An Unconventional Handbook. "Mr. Weller's knowledge of London was extensive and peculiar."—*Pickwick*. (London and New York: Macmillan & Co.)—This little book in paper covers costs only thirty-five cents. Its four-by-six-inch page is divided into three narrow columns; the print is too fine for comfortable reference, and made worse by the thinness of the paper, which allows the printing on the other side to confuse the eye. It is to be wished that inexpensiveness had not been carried quite so far; a seventy-cent book might have been much more than twice as good. It contains, however, an immense amount of curious and interesting matter, and that of so diversified and in some cases unexpected a character that the only way to deal with it is to set forth what we find in it that is especially noticeable, and what we miss that we had hoped to find. There are some useful maps; one, in outline, of the Thames from Teddington above London to Gravesend below, thus giving thirty miles of country east and west, and twice as much of the river in its windings. In this map it is pleasant to find, what the atlases do not give, the well-known names of Northfleet Hope and Fidler's Reach, and so on up the river to Blackwall Reach, Limehouse Reach, and the Lower and Upper Pool, until it seems as if we were coming from sea under the pilotage of Poor Jack. There is a skeleton plan of the London underground railways, a guide much needed by any visitor not familiar with their gloomy convolutions; there is a map of the railway stations around London, from Enfield to Epsom and from Windsor to beyond Woolwich; finally, there are maps of small pieces of London taken from its densest quarters, well conceived but not clearly printed, and almost impossible to use for finding any given street amid the tangle. They serve to remind the New-Yorker how little he has to charge his memory with in comparison with what the Londoner has to know, living in a town five times as large and one where most of the streets are only a square or two long, and where the seemingly-continuous thoroughfare is Charles Street, Queen Street, Short Street, and something else in the length of a quarter-mile.

Under the heading "Fog" is an account of a "London Particular," with an attempted analysis of its composition. Under "Gas" is a full and apparently thorough account of the rules and customs of the gas-companies and a store of advice for the gas-consumer. Under "Nuisances" is a list of the disagreeables which may be avoided or removed, (a) by application to the first policeman, (b) by appeal to a police court, or (c) by lawsuit only. Among these last is church-bell ringing, so that it appears that Londoners who live near noisy chimneys have no ready way of stopping them, in which lack of power they will receive the sympathy of residents of upper Fifth Avenue. Under "Opium Dens" and "Rateliff Highway" is something about the holes for smoking opium described in "Edwin Drood." Under "Black Eye" you are told who undertakes the

speedy cure or concealment (which?) of that infliction. Under "Bohemia" is a definition of the free-and-easy life known by that geographical term. Under "Paintings" is a really wonderful thing—an alphabetical list of painters, sculptors, and architects whose works may be found in London, with the places where these may be found: thus, one is sent, to study Gainsborough, to nine different public institutions, some of which are the last places in which one would look. So that it will be seen that this book takes in a wide extent of information, while we have to say of it that in almost every case there has gone to its make-up a very intelligent sort of criticism. It is, therefore, matter of surprise that we find no mention of the Thames embankment as a recent construction of singular importance; not a word of Hampstead Heath or Hampstead, while many small places around London are described; no account of "Greenwich"—a brief mention of the hospital and school, indeed, but nothing about fish-dinners or the "Trafalgar" or "Ship"; no mention of the Temple, nor of Apsley House, nor of Smithfield, nor of Sergeant's Hall; and under "Cleopatra's Needle" mention of its whereabouts only, with nothing about its origin or value. "Gog and Magog" is a most unsatisfactory article. One finds "Rag and Famish," and a reference to the club which is so called, but under the Club title no mention of the nickname; and this is a real disappointment, for we had hoped to find that by-word explained. Under "America" one is referred to "United States" and "Dominion of Canada," but neither of those titles appears. This list of non-appearances and failures might be much prolonged, but it can serve only as a reason for asking the compiler and the publishers to give us a new edition, enlarged and greatly improved in style and appearance.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
American Firemen, 2d ed.	(H. L. Chaplin)
Balbock (H. S.), Trifles: Poetry	(Providence)
Burnett (Mrs. F. H.), Miss Crespiigny, swd.	(Chas. Scribner's Sons) \$0 30
Theo, swd.	30
Collins (Rev. W. L.), Montaigne	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)
Froude (J. A.), Caesar	(Chas. Scribner's Sons) 2 50
Ghost of Redbrook: a Tale	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.) 1 25
Goncourt (E.), Les Frères Zeigmanno, swd.	(F. W. Christern)
Greville (H.), Markof	(T. B. Peterson & Bros.) 1 50
Heiprin (M.), Historical Poetry of the Ancient Hebrews, Vol. I.	(D. Appleton & Co.) 2 00
Holtzendorf (Dr. F. von), Principien der Politik, 2d ed., swd.	(Carl Habel)
Hunt (W. M.), Hints for Pupils in Drawing and Painting	(Houghton, Osgood & Co.) 2 00
Just One Day	(Geo. R. Lockwood)
Koolman (J. ten D.), Wörterbuch der Ostfriesischen Sprache, Vol. I., A-G, swd.	(Herm. Braams)
Lady's Knitting-book, swd.	(A. D. F. Randolph & Co.) 25
Lady's Crochet-book, swd.	25
Leighton (R. F.), History of Rome	(Clark & Maynard)
Leffingwell (Rev. C. W.), Reading-book of English Classics	(G. P. Putnam's Sons)
Lewes (G. H.), The Study of Psychology	(Houghton, Osgood & Co.) 2 00
Longfellow (H. W.), Poems of Places: British America; Oceania, 2 vols.	(Houghton, Osgood & Co.) 2 00
Longfellow (H. W.), Evangeline: übersetzt von Frank Siller	(Dorflinger & Co.)
Marryat (Florence), A Star and a Heart, swd.	(A. K. Loring)
Mead (Prof. C. M.), The Soul Here and Hereafter	(Cong. Pub. Co.) 1 50
Oncken (W.), Allgemeine Geschichte, Part III., Hellas und Rom, swd.	(B. Westermann & Co.)
Pike (J. S.), First Blows of the Civil War	(Am. News Co.)
Proceedings of the Mass. Historical Society, 1791-1885	(Boston)
Puritan and Quaker: a Tale	(G. P. Putnam's Sons)
Right-hand Record for Leading Advertisers	(H. P. Hubbard) 2 50
Schwab (Prof. E.), The School Garden, swd.	(M. L. Holbrook & Co.) 50
Shirley (P.), On the Verge: a Tale	(A. L. Bancroft & Co.)
Sime (J.), Lessing, 2 vols., swd.	(L. W. Schmidt)
Thompson (M.), The Witchery of Archery, new ed.	(Chas. Scribner's Sons)
Unitarian Affirmations	(Am. Unit. Assn.)
Zola (E.), The Abbe's Temptation, swd.	(T. B. Peterson & Bros.) 75

Leisure-Hour Series.

16mo, \$1 per volume.

WANDERINGS IN PATAGONIA.
THE FIRST VIOLIN.
THE RETURN OF THE NATIVE.

HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

Economic Crumbs;

Or, Plain Talks for the People about Labor, Capital, Money,
Tariff, etc.

By T. T. BRYCE,

Of the Normal and Agricultural Institute, Hampton, Va.

"One of the soundest and, without exception, the simplest upon
the topics treated. Sensible and utterly devoid of financial
sophistries."—*New York Herald*.

For sale at BRENTANO'S, Union Square.

VON TREITSCHKE. Deutsche Geschichte
im 19. Jahrhundert. Vol. I. 8vo, 790 pages, \$3 70.
WERNER. Um hohen Preis. 2 vols., \$2 95.
STAPFER. Shakespeare et l'Antiquité. Vol. I. 8vo, \$2 50.

CARL SCHOENHOF,

Foreign Bookseller and Importer, Boston.

Catalogues on application.

Rare Engravings

and Etchings.

Frederick Keppel, of 243 Broadway,
New York, has just received from
London a large and unusually choice
collection of Engravings and Etchings,
including landscapes, fine portraits, and
sacred and classical subjects, by the
principal engravers of the seventeenth,
eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries.

Correspondence is invited, and en-
gravings will be sent, on approval, to
any address on receipt of reference.

N.B.—Fine engravings can be selected, cost-
ing, when framed, from about \$10, or attractive
subjects in etching from \$2, framed.

HENRY B. BULT,

PRINT SELLER,

RARE AND FINE LINE ENGRAVINGS,
ANCIENT PRINTS, PORTRAITS, ETCHINGS,
PRINTS FOR ILLUSTRATING.
706 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

PHOTOGRAPHS of Gothic and Renaissance
Architecture in Tuscany.—Mr. W. J. Stillman proposes to
issue a series of permanent photographs of twenty-five subjects
chosen from the most interesting works of Gothic and Renaissance
architecture in Tuscany.

The prints will be 7 x 5 inches in size, mounted on card-board
to x 14, and issued in a portfolio. Price \$20 the set. The issue
must be dependent on his obtaining subscriptions for not less than
fifty sets. Subscribers' names will be received by Mr. CHARLES
H. MOORE, Harvard College, Cambridge.

THE NATION.—Volumes and Back
Numbers for sale. Address the pub-
lisher.

"The course of the *Nation* newspaper in its treatment of subjects
connected with money, currency, financial legislation, and capital
and labor, has always, I believe, been eminently sound and wise;
and its files contain the greatest body of serviceable teaching re-
specting these subjects which can be found in this country. It has
also many valuable studies of some of the changes which have
been going on during the last fifteen years in our laws, in our meth-
ods of political action, and in the character of our people. It is
a necessary, for every man and all students of our national thought
and life."—REV. J. B. HARRISON, in the *Christian Register* of
August 17, 1878, in an article on the American Literature of Capital
and Labor and the Organization of Society on the Principles of
Justice.

